

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XVIII.—No. 70.

APRIL, 1942

SHAKESPEARE QUARTOS AS PROMPT-COPIES WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF CHOLMELEY'S PLAYERS AND A NEW SHAKESPEARE ALLUSION¹

BY CHARLES J. SISSON

THE question of the use of quarto editions of Elizabethan plays as prompt-copies has been little considered except by Mr. A. W. Pollard, and in relation to one particular aspect of the question.²

Mr. Pollard's brilliant theory assumed the probability that a company of actors, having surrendered a manuscript prompt-copy of a play to the printers, found the ensuing printed quarto a convenient form of prompt-copy for subsequent use by the company. Certainly a printed quarto would be more legible than even a careful and skilled transcript of the original manuscript play. In his writings upon Shakespeare texts, therefore, no small place is taken by hypotheses concerning textual revision carried out upon printed quartos in the course of their history as prompt-copies used at revivals of the plays in question, as part of the company's repertory.

Thus Mr. Pollard adduces as copy used for the printing of the Folio texts the first Quarto of *Much Ado* and the second Quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, both used in the theatre as prompt-

¹ The closing of the British Museum and the Record Office, with the destruction of my collections and most of my notes, has impeded the proper preparation of this article, and forced me to trust too much to memory.

² Sir Edmund Chambers, in *William Shakespeare* (I., p. 165), reviews the evidence and leaves the question open.

copies, though he qualifies the second example by the observation that the quarto in question had perhaps been corrected from the first Quarto with the help of a theatrical manuscript. In general, Mr. Pollard does not appear to be deeply concerned about any differences between setting up a Folio text from a manuscript prompt-copy and from a quarto used as a prompt-copy.¹

With respect to the Folio text of *Richard II*, however, he makes a stronger claim for a history of the text that involves a quarto text, used as a prompt-copy and revised for stage use, as the foundation of the Folio text.

As soon as the first Quarto was printed its greater handiness and legibility would give it a great advantage over any written text for the purposes of a prompt-copy, and if any written text then existed at the theatre there is every probability that it was destroyed. Some ten years later, when the play was revived and the 'Deposition' scene restored to the acting version . . . the text of this could have been obtained . . . from the original actors' 'parts'. With this addition the First Quarto may have continued in use as a prompt copy right down to the time when the printing of the First Folio was undertaken . . . it is probable . . . that the corrected First Quarto was not sent to the printer, but only placed at the disposal of whoever was intrusted with the task of preparing the historical section of the First Folio for the press.²

The Folio text, it is argued, was set up from Quarto 5 of 1615 (which rests upon Quarto 1 of 1597) with the help of the playhouse copy of Quarto 1, corrected from time to time and brought up to date as a prompt-copy.

I am not here concerned with the evidence upon which Mr. Pollard bases his conclusions, evidence of stage-directions, names of actors and other theatrical notes, and omissions and additions, but rather with the general hypothesis that printed quarto plays were used in the theatre as prompt-copies. The bibliographical and textual analyses of Mr. Pollard give strong support to such a hypothesis in respect of a number of plays of Shakespeare. The question is of no small importance in the general problem of the transmission of Shakespeare's copy.

My intention is to adduce further evidence in support of this general hypothesis, from other sources. Some of this evidence lends great probability to the hypothesis, and some furnishes certainty.

¹ *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos; Foundations of Shakespeare's Text; Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates.*

² *Richard the Second. A New Quarto.* 1916, pp. 98-9.

In the first place, the early history of printed plays indicates clearly enough that the publishers of plays were giving consideration to the needs and the resources of companies of players. The reason for this was beyond question their desire to effect sales of printed plays to such companies of players.

The title-page of Rastell's interlude of *The Four Elements* is significant enough. It is designed almost exclusively for the attention of practical men of the theatre, giving them information and directions necessary for men in search of a play to act. It runs thus

A new interlude and a mery of the nature of the iiij elemente . . . whiche interlude yf y^e hole matter be playde wyl conteyne the space of an hour and a halfe/but yf ye lyst ye may leue out muche of the sad mater as the messengers pte/and some of naturys parte and some of experyens pte & yet the matter wyl depend conueniently/and than it wyll not be paste thre quarters of an hour of length.

Here folow the namys of the pleyers

The messenger/Nature naturate/Humanyte Studyous desire/Sensuall appetyte/The tauerner/Experyence/yngnoraunce Also yf ye lyst ye may brynge in a dysgysynge.

The leader of a company of professional interluders, or the ambitious amateur of an Inn of Court, as he passed the book-shop with its books set out in sets of sheets, title-page uppermost, saw all that he needed for his purpose. Here was displayed information about the subject-matter and title of a possible play, the duration of the piece in acting, and the number of actors required, before ever he paid his sixpence. And for his sixpence¹ he had all the requisite material for a prompt-copy of a play, and a new play at that.

The evidence of this interlude is supported by other title-pages, e.g.

A Newe Interlude of Impacyente pouerte newly Imprynted.

Foure men may well and easelye playe this Interlude.

Peace and Coll hassarde and Cōscyence, for one man.

Haboundance and mysrule for another man.

Impaciente pouerte, Prosperyte, and pouerte, for one man.

Enuye and the sommer for another man.

Here the precise distribution of parts is notified, saving the inquirer a good deal of careful analysis of the text and action. As before, the bait of newness is laid out as an attraction.

In William Griffith's edition of *Horestes*, in 1567, most of the title-page is taken up with a list of 'the players names', numbering twenty-

¹ More probably fourpence in the middle of the sixteenth century, and sixpence later on.

five, and including such exciting persons as Horestes, Clytemnestra, Menelaus and Nestor, as well as The Vice. Lest this huge cast should daunt the purchaser, however, a hand with pointing finger reassures him with a schedule: 'The names deuided for vi. to playe'. The first actor has three parts, including the Vice, the second and third five parts each, the fourth Horestes, a woman, and Prologue, the fifth has seven parts, and the sixth four.¹

In *Horestes* as in *Impatient Poverty* the title-page is headed by emphatic type declaring A NEWE interlude. Similarly Hugh Jackson's 1578 edition of *THE COMMODY OF the moste vertuous and Godlye Susanna, neuer before this tyme Printed*, has clear indications.

¶ Eyght persons may easly play it.

Each of the proposed eight has his roles set opposite his number. Of these Sensualitas and Susanna alone have no double parts. It will be noticed that the number of actors necessary is increasing. The play was printed two years after the opening of the first great professional theatres in London, The Theatre and The Curtain, in 1576. And the first words to catch the eye of the passer-by are 'The Commody'. Similar evidence is offered by the title-pages of plays printed as late as *Cambises*, for eight players, ca. 1584, and *Like Will to Like*, for five, in 1587.

It is to be observed that the speakers' names in early printed plays are generally set out in the order of their appearance, as in modern programmes. So it is, for example, in *The Disobedient Child* and *Damon and Pythias*, both 1571, *Apius and Virginia*, 1575, *All for Money*, 1578, and *The Conflict of Conscience*, 1581.² In *Horestes*, players 1 to 6, each with his load of doubled parts, first appear on the stage in that order. In a play of mainly literary interest, on the other hand, for example, *Gorboduc or Ferrex and Porrex*, the speakers' names are classed in order of precedence, with no relation to stage-production.

Finally, we have such direct evidence of the intention behind the printing of plays as is given in two early quartos. The title-page of *The Conflict of Conscience* gives

The Actors names, deuided into six partes, most conuenient for such as be disposed, either to show this Comedie in priuate houses, or otherwise.

¹ Total twenty-seven. But 'Prologue' is not mentioned in the list. And the part of Idumeus is shared between two players, further evidence of the exactness of these indications for practical purposes.

² The years are the dates of printing.

So *Damon and Pythias* is described as

Newly imprinted, as the same was shewed before the Queenes Maiestie, by the Children of her Graces Chappell, except the Prologue that is somewhat altered for the proper vse of them that hereafter shall haue occasion to plaie it, either in Priuate, or open AudIENCE.

There is little doubt that we have clear indications of the actual preparation of the printer's copy for this purpose, and not merely the reproduction in print of a manuscript prompt-copy, with such remarkably full stage directions as we have, for example, in *All for Money* or *Horestes*.

It is not necessary to multiply examples of such title-pages offering proof that booksellers sought to attract purchasers for plays not only among general readers but among practical men of the theatre, and that certain parts of the necessary preparation of the play for stage-production were already done in the printed copy. The title-pages of these interludes, indeed, take us beyond the accepted view that popular plays were refused to the printer by the companies owning them, lest rival companies should purchase a printed copy and transcribe it into a prompt-copy. They offer the presumption rather that the actual printed copies were prepared with a view to stage-use and served themselves as prompt-copies.

There would, indeed, be little need for any transcript to be made for this purpose, especially where the ordinary travelling company, or provincial company, was concerned. Deletions could readily be made on the quarto, as suggested in *The Four Elements*. And there was little likelihood of any notable additions to the text. The most likely interpolations would be in the nature of gags, or 'business' like the 'disguising' suggested in *The Four Elements*.

An interesting conjecture by Sir Edmund Chambers¹ suggests the purchase of a printed book for this purpose as early as 1558 by the Wardens of Bungay who, he writes, must have obtained a copy of one of the printed interludes which by that time the London stationers had issued in some numbers.

He thus interprets an item recorded in the Wardens' accounts involving the payment of fourpence for an 'interlude and game-book' and two shillings 'for writing the parts'. With no payment for a transcript of the book for prompt use, the book itself must have served the prompter's turn. And this, indeed, can hardly be doubted.

These probabilities become certainties when we consider the

¹ *The Medieval Stage*, II., pp. 144, n. 2, 192, 343.

evidence of the Chicago copy of *A Looking Glass for London and England*. Here is an actual surviving example of a printed quarto adapted for use as a prompt-copy with manuscript notes and stage-directions. It is even possible, thanks to the stage-direction inserted, 'M^r Reason', to identify the company using it as Prince Charles's Men, led by Gilbert Reason, on a tour at some time between 1613 and 1625.¹

The strongest and most direct evidence of all is offered in relation to the activities of a provincial company of actors in Yorkshire, whose story has been occupying my interest at intervals during the last thirteen years and has led me very far in the endeavour to present a complete picture, too far perhaps for reason. But political and religious matters of far-reaching interest are closely related to the activities and career of the Simpsons' Company, of whom some mention may be found in Sir E. K. Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage*,² and whom I should prefer to describe as Sir Richard Cholmeley's Players. The title will help to bring their status into proper perspective.

It is evident that this is not the place for a full account of the company, but only for such information as is relevant to the present inquiry. Professor J. T. Murray has given references,³ from 1558 onwards, to a large number of citizen players in many towns, and to many provincial companies of actors attached to the service, or under the patronage, of various noblemen and gentlemen, to add to the list of London companies who toured the provinces. Some surprise may perhaps be caused by hearing of such a company apparently in the service of the Bishop of Exeter in 1560. And it is interesting to know that Shakespeare's Sir Thomas Lucy not only welcomed actors at Charlecote but, in 1583, had his own company, which acted a play at Coventry and received ten shillings from the city for their pains.⁴

References in contemporary literature indicate that local companies of players travelling about the country were a familiar feature in Shakespeare's England. In the play, *Northward Ho*, for example, Greenshield refers to 'a company of country players, that are come to town here, shall furnish us with hair and beard' (Act v, Scene i).

¹ I have unfortunately not been able, owing to present circumstances, to consult the printed facsimile of this copy, and have had to rely on cursory notes made upon seeing the facsimile on its first appearance some years ago.

² *The Elizabethan Stage*, I., pp. 304, n. 1, 328, n. 3; II., p. 339.

³ *English Dramatic Companies*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 238.

The scene is an inn at Ware. So in satire, as in *Pasquil's mad-cappe, throwne at the corruptions of these times* (1626):

Tell country players, that old paltry jests
Pronounced in a painted motley coate,
Fills all the world so full of cuckoes nests,
That nightingales can scarcely sing a note.

The general contempt in which such companies seem to be held in satire or caricature is not, however, to be considered as irrefragable evidence. Shakespeare, as usual, holds the balance even, unless the players in *Hamlet*, treated with such serious respect by the Prince, are to be taken as a Danish equivalent of his own company, in contrast with the mechanics of Athens. Certainly it will not do to dismiss country players merely as purveyors of 'old paltry jests'. Middleton, in his *Mayor of Queenborough*, is aware of the evidently familiar fact that they were in the habit of buying printed plays to furnish forth their repertory, in a reference to thieves who 'only take the name of country comedians to abuse simple people with a printed play or two, which they bought at Canterbury for sixpence' (Act v, Scene i). Nor were they necessarily to be considered as amateur players in contrast with professionals.

Further information concerning 'country players' comes to light occasionally in Star Chamber records, in which I find two companies of village or town amateur players acting dramatic performances of a libellous nature, one at Wells¹ and one at Axminster. A third instance at Osmotherly in 1601, when a libel in the nature of an operetta was 'sunge by stage players as Jigge vpon the staige at the end of their playe',² undoubtedly in my opinion was performed by Cholmeley's professional Players, concerning whom much information is available in a voluminous set of Star Chamber documents recording their trial, along with Sir John York and Lady Julian York, for sedition.³ One of the principal charges against them was that of having acted a seditious play, of Catholic purport, at York's house, Gowthwaite Hall in Nidderdale, about Christmas 1609.

Early in 1611, it appears, a number of Catholic recusants, with their homes at Egton, Whitby and Staithes, were organized as a company with authority under the hand and seal of Sir Richard Cholmeley of Whitby and Roxby to travel about the country and to act plays.

¹ C. J. Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, pp. 162-85.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 129-40.

³ *St. Ch.* 8. 19/10. There is further information in other documents, e.g. *St. Ch.* 8. 12/11.

But their history begins at least five years earlier. The core of the company was a group of Simpsons from Egton, the leader being Christopher Simpson. There were four other Simpsons: Robert, John, Richard and Cuthbert. They are described as shoemakers or cordwainers. After Christopher the most important member of the company was Edward Whitfield, who also had a brother Robert with him. William Harrison was the principal comedian of the party, and acted the fool's or clown's parts. With Edward Consett, George Ellerby, James Button, George Hodgson, Edward Millinton, and two boys, Thomas Pant and Robert Lawnde, the company that visited Gowthwaite in 1609 numbered no less than fifteen. Two other members of the company, Francis Danby and John Lee, seem to have left it shortly before. In 1609 Richard Simpson was eighteen years of age, Harrison thirty-six, Edward Whitfield twenty, Pant fifteen and Lawnde fourteen. The extent to which the company was a stable organization may be judged by the fact that its leader, like Burbage and other famous London actors, took actor-apprentices. Pant joined the company in this capacity in 1606:

I was borne in yorkshier & . . . was bound prentice when I was about 12 years of adg to one Christopher Simpson a shoemaker. & . . . Simpson with others did vse to playe playes in the wynter tyme in townes and gentlemens houses & did trayne me vpp there.

It was then, surely, an established company when Pant joined it in 1606, and it had a further career lasting until at least 1616. It is clear that we must beware of applying to all such provincial companies, even if they were shoemakers by trade, the satire in Shakespeare's picture of the rude mechanics rehearsing 'obscenely and courageously' in the wood near Athens. It is unreasonable to doubt that this company took its work seriously, was well-trained and capable. A nearer parallel in Shakespeare is given by the professional players in *Hamlet*. Even there six, or at most seven, is the total of the company. Perhaps the nearest parallel is, in fact, Shakespeare's own company. It is possible that Shakespeare's satire is not wholly disinterested, and that the London companies on their provincial tours found local companies formidable rivals.

Such companies travelled far. A Nottinghamshire company performed at Leicester. Cholmeley's Players seem to have covered all Yorkshire on their tours, from Whitby on the coast to Gowthwaite deep in Nidderdale in the West. A winter tour of 1609 may be traced fairly clearly from Whitby through Pickering to Helmsley, on to

Thirsk and Ripon, and so to Nidderdale, thence to Richmond and back eastwards through Northallerton and so home again. And it appears also that they toured in the summer and winter alike. In fact the probability is that their theatrical profession was their sole occupation throughout the year. They found an audience in most towns in the shire. And I can make a list of some dozen or so great houses where they acted every year, with regular patrons, acting one or more plays and staying one or two nights accordingly at each house. Their travelling career was chequered by fear of arrest, by pursuits, flight and escape, because of the part they played in the religious conflicts of the time, for they were Catholics and their persuasion and that of most of their audiences was reflected in their performances. But it is clear that for the most part they were able to continue tours punctuated by these interferences.

They were, in fact, serious rivals to a travelling London company. If they were able to act plays of equal quality and fame with those of the London companies, it was the more serious rivalry; most of all if they anticipated the very plays which a London company could offer as its best and latest.

Shakespeare himself gives in *Hamlet* a picture of the arrival of Cholmeley's Men at Gowthwaite Hall in Nidderdale towards Christmas in 1609. They were received in the court-yard by Roger Habergeon, Sir John York's bailiff, and some of the leading actors were taken into the Hall where Sir John himself met them and discussed their repertory with them. Sir John decided for the play of *Saint Christopher*. The performance took place the same evening in the Hall, into which were crowded some hundred people. The bailiff supervised entries at the Hall door. Some sixty persons were kept out, and one girl, damaged in the crush at the door, was consoled by Sir John with a gift of money. The performance took place on an improvised stage, with properties and stage effects. It appears that young John York, Sir John's nephew and heir, then eleven years of age, may have taken some part in the performance, doubtless a small part. One is inevitably reminded of more famous amateur actors, of Hamlet giving some taste of his skill to the Players, and of Sir Thomas More, both as page and even as Lord Chancellor, improvising parts in plays.

The repertory of plays offered by Cholmeley's Players was one of extraordinary interest. In the first place, it consisted of printed books. When, on one occasion, Sir Stephen Procter, a local justice, sent his

bailiff, Lemuel Knowles, to arrest the players and to take possession of their 'books', the word might well, of course, have meant manuscript prompt-copies. But over and over again it is stated that the actors played only from printed books. Richard Simpson stated, for example, that

that booke by which he and the other persons did act the said play . . . was a printed booke, And they onelie acted the same according to the contents therein printed, and not otherwise.

Simpson is speaking of *Saint Christopher*. But William Harrison says more generally:

these plaies which they so plaied were vsuall playes And such as were acted in Common and publicke places and Staiges . . . and such as were played publicly and prynted in the bookes.

Whitfield confirms that they were 'played according to the printed booke or Bookes'.

In the second place, the alternative offered to *Saint Christopher* at the Christmas play at Gowthwaite, says Thomas Pant, was 'the three shirleyes'. And at Candlemas 1609-10, William Harrison reports,

one of the playes acted and played was Perocles prince of Tire, And the other was Kinge Lere,

and he then adds the words quoted above concerning the printed books which furnished them their plays. It appears, therefore, that on this occasion the company performed on successive nights two plays of Shakespeare at Gowthwaite Hall.

A very full description of the performance of *Saint Christopher* was given in evidence in Star Chamber. I can find no trace elsewhere of any English play upon this subject either in stage history¹ or in the records of the Stationers' Company. From the account of the action of the play it appears to me to have a close relation with an Italian play, a *Rappresentazione* printed in 1575, which I came across in the Treasure Room of the Widener Library of Harvard College.² All else is for the moment surmise. There are French dramatic

¹ We may not interpret as a stage record Hall's reference in *Satires*, IV, 7, concerning St. Thomas Aquinas:

Would he not laugh to death when he should heare
The shamelesse legends of St. Christopher.

² *Ital.* 7799, 112. 30. The author is given as Cesare Sacchetti of Bologna. *Rappresentatione/di Santo Christoforo/Martire, Ridotta A/Vso di Comedia,/Composta da Cesare Sac/chetti Bolognese,/[/Device]/Nouamente ristampata,/[/Device]/In Fiorenza MDLXXV.*

versions of this saint's life also.¹ But it is to be noted that the resemblances between this English play and the Italian mark it off as varying both from the French play and from mediæval English versions of his life.

It will be observed that, of the three English plays from the London stage and book-market, one was only two years old, and the other two newer still. 'The three shirleyes', more properly *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers*—Sir Thomas, Sir Anthony and Sir Robert Shirley—had been acted by Queen Anne's Men at the Curtain Theatre in 1607, and was printed in the same year. The subject was still topical in 1609, for the Shirleys were alive and much in the public eye. Indeed, two years later, on 13 November, 1611, Sir Robert Shirley was back from Persia and had several audiences of King James, in his capacity as Ambassador to the Shah.² The play related extraordinary adventures in Persia and elsewhere, and the romantic marriage of one of the brethren with an Eastern beauty. One wonders what manner of costume Thomas Pant wore as a Persian princess in the hall of Gowthwaite.

The other two plays both bore upon the title-page of the books the name of William Shakespeare, and were in the current repertory of the most famous of London companies. *King Lear* was first printed in 1608, and the Quarto known as the Pide Bull Quarto was beyond reasonable question the prompt-book for this play. There is no good reason for suspecting that it might have been the old Chronicle History of *King Leir*, by an unknown author, printed in 1605, and certainly more than ten years old. The fact that *Pericles* was the third, printed in 1609 as by Shakespeare, suggests that the Simpsons not only wanted the latest plays available but also the best, and that it is no mere coincidence that both of them were by the most famous and the most successful of London dramatists. All the evidence goes to show that both *Pericles* and *Lear* were very popular plays, and likely to make Cholmeley's Players' repertory exceedingly attractive.

Nor is there any good reason for assuming that the performances were necessarily truncated and inadequate, or that they were in any way a caricature of Shakespeare's art. Miss Julia Engelen has shown that a company of fifteen was more than enough for any of Shakespeare's plays, allowing for doubling. The Star Chamber documents record clearly the actual parts played by nine players in

¹ E.g. the *mystère* printed at Paris, 1493, by Jean Trepperel's widow, and at Grenoble, where it was acted, by Claude Chevalet, 1527-1530.

² *S. P. Dom. James I*, LXVII., 88.

Saint Christopher, and we know the names of thirteen members of the company. Evidence is given, moreover, of considerable resources and equipment for costumes and stage effects, sufficient for the 'chambers' in *The Three English Brothers* and the thunderstorms in *Pericles* and *Lear*.

The question remains whether the printed quarto was actually used as a prompt-copy. And the answer can hardly be doubted. There was no mortal reason why Cholmeley's Players should go to the trouble and expense of making a written transcript of the printed play. All necessary revision could be performed upon the printed page, in the form mainly of passages marked for deletion. In *Lear*, for example, the Quarto edition was obviously too long for stage purposes, as the Folio text demonstrates. And we have not only Mr. Pollard's closely argued hypothesis, but also the example of Prince Charles's Men with *A Looking Glass for London and England*, to fortify this conclusion on grounds of common sense. Richard Simpson's words, already quoted, bear it out in their use of technical terms of recognized significance:

that book *by which* he and the other persons *did act* the said play was a printed booke.

Any Elizabethan would define the word 'prompt-copy' precisely as 'a book *by which* actors act a play'. And a further argument of strong cogency underlies this statement and others of the same trend, which amounted to a defence of the actors against any accusation of acting unauthorized dramatic material.

A printed play was one that had already been allowed to be acted in a London theatre. It had received the licence of the Master of the Revels, acting on behalf of the Lord Chamberlain and giving royal authority. The printed book, moreover, contained the play in the actual form, for the most part, which the Master of the Revels had sanctioned for printing as for acting. It is reasonable to interpret the fact that certain plays were entered for publication in the Stationers' Register under the hand of the Master of the Revels to mean in some measure the certification, not of one, but of a thousand prompt-copies of a given play. From the fact that this form of certification was established in 1607, we may conclude that the custom of using printed plays for this purpose had grown to such an extent that the Master of the Revels was of necessity drawn into the matter. It is obvious, among other considerations, that the Master's profits

from licensing plays were involved in the practice, an aspect of the question to which both Buc and Herbert were likely to be alive.

It follows as a very reasonable possibility that the 'staying' of the printing of plays might be due to the need to have the prompt-copy examined for additions or modifications by the Master of the Revels before it could be circulated as an authorized copy for general acting. The 'further authority' required in several instances might well be the Master's authority, acting for the Lord Chamberlain. So, for example, in 1598, *The Merchant of Venice* could not be printed 'without licence first had from the Lord Chamberlain'. The Lord Chamberlain might well have been considered here as the officer who acted through the Master of the Revels, rather than as the great noble who was the patron of Shakespeare's company. So, again, *The Fleire*, in May 1606, needed good authority before it could be printed, and in October of that year it was in fact authorized by Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels, and was printed. *Troilus and Cressida*, 'stayed' in 1603 for want of sufficient authority, was at last entered in 1609 as licensed by Buc's deputy, Segar. These are deep waters, however, and there is matter here for further careful thought.

It appears clear, at any rate, that this practice was bound to increase the pressure for publication of plays, to raise their market value to the companies who owned them, and to be a matter of interest to the Office of the Revels. It would certainly be a notable encouragement to the pirates, who might conceivably receive more than the market rate for their printed plays, and might even receive rewards from the leaders of provincial companies, whose numbers one should not be too ready to underestimate. When I find, for example, in a satire by a provincial poet at Wells in 1610, an obvious quotation from *Tamburlaine*, 'what, holla, ho, ye pampered Asian jades',¹ we need not postulate a visit from the descendants of the Admiral's Men to Wells, acting the play there. The local Wells company may have acted it themselves.

So that here is, in fact, a further reason why the London companies should be loth to part with their plays to the publishers, and might put every obstacle in the way of printing even old plays, knowing that there was every chance of provincial companies taking them round the country and acting them without let or hindrance. For the London companies went on provincial tours themselves, and these tours were an important factor in their economics. What if

¹ *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, p. 175.

they came, with a definite repertory, to a Yorkshire town, only to find that Cholmeley's Players had forestalled them with their own plays!

One further point remains, concerning alterations and additions to the printed copy of a play. It appears that Cholmeley's Players acted two versions of their play of *Saint Christopher*, according to the religious colour of their audience. For a Catholic audience, they interpolated scenes representing a conflict between a Protestant minister and a Catholic priest, ending in the extreme discomfiture of the official man of God at the hands of his outlawed rival. In the houses of Protestant magnates these were omitted. I conceive, however, that these scenes would hardly be written in, in the scanty margins of a cheap quarto. I see them rather as improvised scenes, with such a scenario written in as we find in a well-known interpolation in the manuscript play of *The Faithful Friends*, but more briefly, as in the marginal notes in certain early printed plays, and left to be interpreted possibly by gagging, a familiar phenomenon on the Elizabethan stage.¹

What is really important, however, appears to me to be the insistence of Cholmeley's Players, in their own defence against charges in Star Chamber, that they only acted plays which were in print and allowed, exactly as they were printed. It is evident that in their eyes the use of a printed play as prompt-copy was equivalent to a licence from the Master of the Revels and gave them complete protection. They therefore denied that they made or acted any addition to the printed text. 'The play', said Richard Simpson,

was suffered and permitted to be acted in other places, and there was no new addition or new matter put into it but as was acted before in other places, and printed in the said book.

It is certain that this was in part false evidence. One is inevitably led to wonder whether their printed quarto of *Saint Christopher* in English, of which no trace appears to remain, was a myth.² If so, it made matters more difficult for the prosecution. And it strengthens the more the argument for the use of printed plays as prompt-copies, licensed in effect by the Master of the Revels. It seems to be a clearly logical development of the practice established in the early days of

¹ I have been very much struck by marginal additions to the part of Hypocriasy, in the printed play *The Conflict of Conscience*. They suggest a principal actor improving his part with typical gags, which have been subsequently written in and found their way into print.

² One witness says, it is true, that 'the play-book of Sct Christofer was a booke that had byn brought from London'. His authority was the young actor Pant.

the printing of plays, for which the evidence is so abundant and satisfying.

One cannot help wondering further whether some day may not yet bring to light the precious copy of a *Pide Bull Lear*, 'by' which Christopher Simpson acted the play, seeking to rival Burbage in Shakespeare's greatest tragic part, while William Harrison followed him as the Fool through the thunder assiduously rolled out by humbler members of the company, and young Thomas Pant, his apprentice, played Cordelia as conceived by this provincial master, in the Hall of a minor Yorkshire squire at Candlemas 1609.

To sum up, it seems legitimate to conclude that there is sufficient evidence of the use of early printed plays as prompt-copies by their purchasers, of the similar use of a play printed in 1594 by a London company on tour late in the reign of James I, and of the normal practice of an important provincial company about the same time. There is no certain instance of such a usage by any company of its own plays in quarto form, or in the last decade of the sixteenth century. But the probabilities, based on textual analysis and on general considerations, appear to me to be strongly in favour of the conclusion that the usage was general.

JONSON'S MASQUES—POINTS OF EDITORIAL PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE

BY W. W. GREG

THE seventh volume of the Oxford Jonson¹ is the most interesting yet published of the text, for not only does it include much of his most pleasing verse, but it raises, owing to the great diversity of textual sources, critical problems more varied and exciting than any of its predecessors. It is also the bulkiest. This was partly inevitable, since it was obviously desirable to keep all the masques and entertainments together; but the unfinished plays, *The Sad Shepherd* and *Mortimer*, might with advantage have been included in the previous volume.

The variety and occasional complexity of the problems that arise in connexion with the thirty-seven masques and similar pieces afford the editors an opportunity to show their mettle. I need not say that they tackle the difficulties of the texts with their habitual thoroughness and attention to detail, as well as with the confidence of long experience. Perhaps it is equally unnecessary to say that the novel problems here raised also afford greater opportunity for difference of opinion on the best methods of dealing with them; and if I venture to express some dissent on incidental points of procedure, I would not be thought unmindful or unappreciative of the care that Mr. and Mrs. Simpson have devoted to their heavy task, or of their paramount authority on all matters touching Jonson's text. It would be waste of time to comment on the many aspects of their work that can only command our admiration. It will be more profitable to discuss debatable matters and point out a few incidental failings. The virtues of the work one takes for granted.

Of the pieces in question eleven are only in the folio of 1616, five only in that of 1641, one has reached us only in manuscript. This leaves twenty for which there is a choice of texts. Besides the

¹ Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Vol. VII Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1941. Pp. xxvii + 814. 35s. net.

folio there is in thirteen instances an earlier quarto, in four a manuscript; in three there are both a manuscript and an earlier edition. 'Four of the late masques', we are told, 'have been printed from the Quarto texts—*Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion*, *The Fortunate Isles*, *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, and *Chloridia*: the text which Jonson himself issued is preferable to the reprints of the 1640 [1641] Folio' (p. xxvii).¹ With this rather naive comment no one is likely to disagree: what readers will ask themselves is whether it does not apply to other pieces as well. To answer this question some examination of the several texts is necessary.

In the four instances in which the quarto text has been chosen, all masques of the 1641 collection, the folio is a simple reprint, though it does now and then correct an error of the earlier text. But in three other pieces conditions appear to be precisely similar, namely, the Queen's masques of *Blackness* and *Beauty* and the Haddington marriage masque that was published along with them. In these the folio was printed from the quarto apparently without revision; it is not questioned that Jonson read the quarto proofs, and it is definitely denied (p. xxvi) that he read those of the folio.² There appears, therefore, to be every reason for making the quarto the basis of a modern edition. These three pieces belong to the collection of 1616, and it is understandable that the editors should have been tempted to cling to an authority that has served them so well in the past. Still, seeing that they have anyhow abandoned it in one instance (*The Masque of Queens*) and that textual conditions in the masques are admittedly different from what they are in the plays, constancy on this occasion appears a doubtful virtue. Again, much the same conditions prevail in the London pageant, in *A Panegyre*, and in the Althorp entertainment (which were again published together), in *Lovers made Men*, and in *Time Vindicated*. In each case the folio is a reprint, and the quarto is admitted to afford the better text. The only excuse for following the folio (whether of 1616 or 1641) is that the text shows signs of having been touched up before it was reprinted. But the changes made were sporadic and could easily have been introduced into a text based on the quarto.

¹ The editors throughout speak of the 'third volume' as the 'Folio of 1640'; but since two of the special title-pages it contains are dated 1641, it seems certain that it was not published till that year.

² At least, so I interpret the editors' statement that 'Jonson did not read the proofs of the masques in the 1616 Folio as he had read the proofs of the plays'. It might, I suppose, mean that he did not read them with the same care. But in the case of *The Masque of Queens* we are told that 'Jonson cannot have looked at the proofs' (p. 273).

I think it is clear that any critical text should be so based.¹ In *Hymenaei* the circumstances are peculiar. The masque was written for the Essex-Howard wedding in 1606, and the quarto of that year admittedly contains the more correct text. But after the scandal of the divorce Jonson, reprinting the piece in the 1616 folio, removed all mention of the original occasion, and incidentally all acknowledgments to his collaborators. No doubt it is a sound general rule to print a work in the form the author finally gave it; still, in the present instance the paramount interest of the original occasion might justify an editor in making an exception.

Some other cases are more doubtful and deserve a little discussion. For the *Christmas* masque or show we have, besides the 1641 folio, a contemporary manuscript, preserved in the Folger Library, that gives a complete text of the songs and speeches: the folio adds some elaborate descriptions of costumes and properties, which are, however, quite detached from the text proper. Manuscript and print are independent, and each on occasion corrects the other; but on the whole the former seems the more reliable. 'The text of the manuscript is good. It recovers for us two lost speeches at lines 110-12: their omission in the Folio must have been an accident. It preserves [two] Jonsonian spellings . . . The punctuation [is] usually good' (p. 433). If this is so, it is a question whether the manuscript is not the better authority, and whether it might not have been well to print it with supplements from the folio. I am not, it is true, quite convinced of the alleged omission: l. 113 seems in a measure to duplicate l. 110 as a reply to l. 109, and it does not answer the question in l. 112. It is possible, therefore, that ll. 110-12 are a first draft properly cancelled in the folio. On the other hand, the lines would come in very aptly after l. 116, where they would distinctly improve the dialogue. This suggests that they may have been a late addition to the original, and that they were misplaced in copying the manuscript. In that case the manuscript represents a later state of the text than the folio, and has therefore an additional claim to be adopted as the copy-text.

A somewhat similar case is *The Masque of Augurs*, except that here the second text is a quarto. This, however, according to the editors,

¹ There may have been a difficulty in respect of *Time Vindicated*. I understand that Mr. Pforzheimer, who possesses the only copy of the quarto, proposes to publish a facsimile and may naturally not wish to forestall it. Dr. J. Q. Adams (*The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 50) has a note to the effect that 'in the Dulwich MS. *Time Vindicated* is called *The Prince's Masque*'. I know nothing of this manuscript and the editors do not mention it.

was not the source of the folio, which makes certain additions and alterations to the text and supplies some marginal comment. 'We have necessarily followed the Folio text, correcting it from the Quarto, especially in the matter of punctuation' (p. 627). This seems to admit that so far as it goes the quarto is the more reliable, and the editors borrow from it, not only when necessary, as in ll. 314 and 377, but even unnecessarily in ll. 13, 22, 28, &c. In fact, the independence of the folio seems to me questionable. That its spelling is more divergent than in other instances where it is a reprint may be due to a difference of compositors. If the editors are correct in assuming that something was accidentally omitted in the quarto at the junction of sheets A and B, and that the folio fudged the text to cover the lacuna,¹ it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the folio is in fact dependent on the quarto. In that case the 'necessity' to follow the folio is less apparent, and I would suggest that the editors might have been better advised to print the superior quarto text, introducing the folio alterations and adding the commentary, though I know that the suggestion will offend their conservative instincts.

The greater textual complexity presented by *The Masque of Queens*, of which we have both a manuscript and a quarto besides the 1616 folio, is in fact only apparent; for the folio is pronounced 'a bad reprint of the Quarto' (p. 273) and can therefore be neglected, though it does supply a few corrections, such as 'Porphyrio' in l. 179 note, where both the manuscript and the quarto apparently have 'Porphyrie'.² It is also held that the manuscript and the quarto are derived immediately from the same original. In view of the fact that the Royal MS. is autograph, a presentation copy to Prince Henry, there could hardly be any doubt which to choose as copy. At the same time it is clear that the original underwent some not unimportant revision before it was sent to press (pp. 271-2). By incorporating these alterations and certain incidental corrections in their text, the editors had a 'unique opportunity' of presenting it in its most authoritative form as Jonson finally intended it to stand. They have preferred to offer what is in effect a diplomatic print: 'We

¹ Believing this they surely ought not to have left the folio makeshift standing at l. 249, but rather to have printed: 'I know not whom. (GRO.) NOT. Or some Welsh Pilgrims.'

² The editors make no mention of the fact that there are two settings of part of the folio text, and the variants are generally ignored: they are indeed negligible. At the same time it may be well to remark that the setting which has the correct reading 'animus' in l. 611 has the misprint 'Palmerynes' for 'Palmyrenes' in l. 617. The editors' collation '*animas* F1 originally' suggests that they believe the former to be a press correction, which it is not.

have taken the holograph for our text and reproduced it *verbatim*. The few errors [Jonson] made in transcribing are faithfully reproduced' (p. 269).¹ Actually not all the errors of the manuscript are errors of transcription; about half those detailed also appear in the quarto (according to the editors' collations) and must therefore have been reproduced from the original. Jonson apparently did intend 'confodit' in l. 284 note, error though it be.² One can sympathize with a desire to treat the autograph as 'sacrosanct' (p. 274) and at the same time respectfully suggest that there is a distinction between facsimile reproduction and editing.

In *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* the textual authorities really are complex. Since, however, there is no question that any modern edition must be based on the Heber manuscript, the only problem concerns its interpretation. To this I propose to return.

Comparatively simple is the case of *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, of which, besides the 1641 folio we possess an early manuscript. This appears to be generally more correct than the printed text, and I shall certainly not quarrel with the editors for allowing 'the unique character of the Manuscript' (whatever that may mean) to decide their choice of copy-text (p. 477). At the same time 'The Folio text is a slight revision', the descriptions having been put into the past tense for publication. Here then the editors have disregarded those final adjustments of the author's that are in some other cases their only excuse for adhering to the folio text. And I feel bound to point out that intrinsically there seems less reason to displace the folio in this instance than where there is an early quarto: it is here at least an independent text and not a reprint.

Of less importance are the manuscripts of the Welbeck and Bolsover entertainments. The folio is rightly reproduced as furnishing a revised text, though the manuscripts supply one or two corrections. The editors have introduced a couple of important emendations where manuscript and print alike misplace fragments of the text.

It will be seen that there is a good deal of diversity, and some apparent inconsistency, in the editors' treatment of the original texts. This no doubt lends variety and perhaps bibliographical

¹ Thus they print 'susequebatur' for 'subsequebatur' in l. 67 note; but at l. 612 they cannot refrain from introducing their favourite brackets in 'mulicēbris'.

² Gifford proposed to read 'confundit': according to the present editors 'Jonson should have written "confudit"'. But is not *confudit* the perfect of *confundo*, and is not the perfect of *confodio*, *confūdīt* not *confōdīt*? If so, where is the 'false quantity' complained of on p. 269? I am too ignorant of Latin to be other than diffident in suggesting that the editors have tripped up.

interest to their edition; but I should have welcomed some more explicit discussion of the principles that have governed their procedure, or at least some recognition of the fact that there are critical principles involved. As it is one gets the impression, perhaps a quite erroneous impression, that the grounds of their choice have been what I may perhaps describe as emotional (reverence for the 'sacrosanct' holograph, the 'unique' manuscript) rather than rational.

So much for the broader questions of textual criticism: I pass to comments on incidental points of interest. They mostly concern matters touched on by the editors in their introductory notes.

The Sad Shepherd. It seems to me that if the editors are correct (as I think they are) in supposing that at I. v. 108 Jonson gave the words 'The Turtles of the Wood' to Karolin, forgetting that he had left the stage, then Karolin's they are, and to transfer them to Lionel, because he happens to be available, is mere vamping.¹

Mortimer. The editors were obviously right to bring I. i. 6 from the margin into the text; but something has gone wrong in the process. In their text there is no stop after 'King': the collation, however, runs 'King!] King. F' (actually F has '*King.*'). Apparently the editors intended but forgot to transfer the 'shriek' from the end of l. 5 (replacing it presumably by a comma) to the end of l. 6. But the dash at the end of l. 5 should go: in the original it is a guide line to the marginal addition. The note at the end of the fragment is in some copies 'Hee dy'd, and left it unfinished', in others merely 'Left unfinished'. Is there any ground for the assertion that the latter is the earlier?

The King's Entertainment, &c. The bibliography of the quarto is intricate and obscure, and seems to have puzzled the editors. I trust that my notes, which they courteously acknowledge, are not responsible for the description of the make-up of the volume on p. 68, which appears defective and contradictory, and would be to me unintelligible if I did not already know the facts. Variants between copies of the quarto are frequent, and there was a partial resetting (with corrections as well as errors) of several pages of the second part containing the Althorp² entertainment. With one or two exceptions

¹ The Cambridge Shakespeare follows Capell in an equally unjustifiable transfer in 2 *Henry IV.* I. i. 161.

² The early editions give the name of Lord Spencer's seat in Northants in the spelling 'Althrope': the editors in their introduction alternate between 'Althorpe' and 'Althorp'. But the modern Althorpe (with an 'e') is a different place, in Lincolnshire.

the variants appear to be normal. Those on B₄^v of Part I, however, are unexpected: they seem to imply four distinct stages of correction of the forme. The second variant in l. 570 of the same is altogether anomalous (and what of copy *F*?). I suspect that the real reading is 'guest;' and that the semi-colon has merely failed to print in *B* and *H*. (The collations record no stop at all in the quarto.) The next variant (l. 590) is a catchword: in the footnote 'l. 59' should of course be 'l. 591', but I am not clear as to the meaning. Is the line really found on different pages in different copies? or is the categorical statement that 'Jonson's notes forced [the printer] to carry it over' only a rather fanciful conjecture to explain the variant catchword? A reference to the collations (made no easier by the absence of line numbers on the page in question) merely increases my bewilderment. In view of these variants a remark on p. 67 that a 'final note in the Quarto' was 'afterwards cancelled' is liable to misconstruction: it appears (with slight differences) in all copies of the quarto, but was omitted from the folio. The folio was not a very happy text to choose, especially for the Althorp entertainment. It must have been the printer who was responsible for the inappropriate heading 'A Satyre', which misled Gifford into supposing it the title of the show, but the present editors nevertheless retain it. The footnote on p. 112, giving details of the title-page 'in the Folio of 1640', is incorrect: there is no title-page in *F2*. The first footnote on p. 121 belongs to p. 120 (and the first on p. 453 to p. 451).

The Queen's Masques of Blackness and Beauty. The editors should not have reproduced the title-page of 'Masques at Court' from the 1616 folio as if it belonged to these two pieces. It was evidently intended as a special title to the whole 'Masques' section, the motto originally selected for the 'Two Royal Masques' being retained for the larger group. An earlier version of *The Masque of Blackness*, with descriptions in the present tense, is among the Royal MSS., and is generously printed in an appendix. It supplies a line missing in the prints. The editors state that they have also 'accepted' from it the correction 'Aboue' in l. 211, but according to their collations this is also the reading of the quarto: 'About' is a mere misprint of the folio. They have made in l. 69 the very happy emendation of 'greces' for 'graces': it is a pity that they mislaid it in the collations. The manuscript variant 'Sweete *Hesperus*' in l. 245 does not appear in the collations at all.

The Masque of Queens. As in several other pieces the marginal

commentary interferes with the line numbering. This may be the cause of some uncertainty in the editors' count. The centred speakers' names are reckoned in the numeration, but not the stanza numbers in ll. 155-99, although they really stand for 'First [Second, &c.] Hag'; moreover the heading 'Dame' has been overlooked at ll. 199 and 284.

Prince Henry's Barriers. There are two settings of most of this piece in the 1616 folio, but the editors appear to have tired of recording insignificant variants. They print what they regard as the original setting, recording 'only the important variants' from the other. The reader is thus of course dependent on the editors' judgment of what is significant—and for my part I am quite content.¹ However, in the first collation note, 'the *t* failed to print in F1' can hardly be correct, seeing that the letter is absent from both settings and is unlikely to have bitten on the frisket.

Oberon. In the matter of variants the note, 'The inner forme of Nnnn was reset', is not quite complete.² It was Mr. Simpson himself who pointed out to me that there are duplicate settings not only of 4N1.6(i) but of most of 4N3.4(o) as well. And there seems to have been some confusion, for in ll. 274 and 305 one setting has 'cōfesse . . . IAMES', the other 'confesse . . . IAMES': the editors print 'confesse . . . IAMES'.

Love Freed. 'Only the chief readings of the reset pages, the outer forme of Oooo 3 and 4, are recorded.' Actually the masque ends on 4O3 recto, and *no* variants on this page are recorded. The only 'reset' (*Re*) reading given is in l. 63, which is on 4N6^v, and this page, so far as I know, was not reset. It is probably an ordinary press correction. Swinburne's emendation of 'airy' for 'angry' is accepted (with the spelling 'ayry'); but the collation 'G[ifford] marks a lacuna' is not very lucid.

¹ They might perhaps have mentioned that F2 appears to have reprinted the first two pages of F1 from the second setting, and the rest from the first setting. This cannot be explained by a mixture of sheets, but suggests the haphazard use of more than one copy of F1 in preparing F2.

² It is also ambiguous. Mr. Simpson, with others who like him are obsessed with a desire for the exact reproduction of typographical minutiae, insists on using 'Nnnn' for what is really Nnnn1 (or better 4N1), because 'Nnnn' is the signature actually printed on the recto of the leaf. Thus, by 'The inner forme of Nnnn' he means 'The inner forme of Nnnn1': but strictly a single page is not a forme at all; what is really meant is 4N1.6(i). Moreover, properly speaking the signature 'Nnnn' designates, not the leaf (4N1), but the whole gathering. 'The inner forme of Nnnn' should therefore (if it meant anything at all) mean the innermost forme of the gathering, namely 4N3.4(i). Incidentally, would it not have been well, when specifying the pages that have been reset, to mention the lines they contain, so that they could be identified in the text?

Love Restored. 'Here again we quote only the more important readings of the reset pages'—but these are not specified. They include, I believe, the inner forme of 4O3.4 as well as the outer forme already mentioned. There is nothing very extraordinary in an isolated *o* or *i* being mistaken for a punctuation mark in Jonson's sometimes minute writing, though the result is a little startling. The error seems to occur twice in this masque, and the editors find another instance in the *English Grammar*. It is conceivable that a like misreading may account for the unintelligible 'make a case: vses' in l. 86, for which Gifford not unhappily conjectured 'make a case of asses'. But 'vses' might of course be a misprint for 'vfes': could this possibly be a form of *aufs* or *oafs*, idiots? If it is, Jonson would seem to have been the first, by a few years, to introduce the word into literature.

A Challenge at Tilt and *The Irish Masque*. Jonson, in printing these pieces, removed all mention of the date and occasion of performance, the scandalous Somerset marriage, for which he also wrote verses which he never published. I think, by the way, that it would have been a help if the editors had throughout mentioned the date of performance where this is known and does not appear in the original. The folio order is not always a reliable guide to the chronology. In the present instance the masque in fact preceded the tilting.

Mercury Vindicated. There is some uncertainty regarding the title, which F1 gives as 'Mercurie Vindicated from the Alchemists at Court by Gentlemen the Kings Seruants', without any punctuation. As the editors remark, 'the King's men certainly did not vindicate Mercury', so that 'by' clearly means 'performed by'. The question is whether 'at Court' means 'performed at Court' (as punctuation in F2 implies) or whether reference is to court alchemists. Since the masque 'deals with the practice of alchemy below stairs at Court', the editors favour the latter interpretation. It seems curious, therefore, that they should support their decision by reference to 'The Irish Masque at Court', where the words undoubtedly mean 'performed at Court'. I may mention that the press corrections in ll. 85-7 are not confined to large-paper copies: my own modest copy has them.

The Golden Age Restored. The order of the final speeches was altered in the course of printing. The editors assert that the state in which *Astraea's* verses come at the end is the later. Is there any ground for this beyond their opinion that it is preferable from a literary point of view?

*Christmas his Masque.*¹ The Folger manuscript previously mentioned has 'an erratic way of writing the indefinite article "a" with an apostrophe or with a grave accent'. May not this peculiarity, which I do not remember to have met elsewhere, be due to a misunderstanding of Jonson's use of an accent on 'a' when it is *not* the article, as in *The Masque of Queens* ('Cat-à-Mountain', 'is now à turning', 'à-sleepe', &c.)? If so it would indicate transcription from an autograph. There are two other manuscripts, Rawlinson and Newcastle, of some of the songs. The agreement of all three convicts the folio of error ('above' for 'about') at l. 172: I think it might be held to do so also at l. 195 ('was' for 'is') and at l. 227 ('more' for 'most'). I wonder what power of divination enables the editors to be certain that a cancelled reading at l. 72 in the Newcastle manuscript is what 'Jonson originally wrote' and not a mere slip of the scribe's.

Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue. Two pages are reproduced from the Chatsworth manuscript: these have enabled Professor F. P. Wilson to identify the handwriting as that of Ralph Crane. They also convict the editors of a couple of misreadings (l. 94 'her' for 'are', l. 285 'y^e' for 'y^t'). It would have been kinder to readers to explain that 'these additions' mentioned in a note at the end of the folio text are the following show called *For the Honour of Wales*, even if the editors preferred to draw a veil over the disingenuousness of Jonson's explanation. I suppose it *is* Jonson's: Digby's editing is hardly likely to have extended to such matters.² Of course the subject is dealt with in vol. ii (p. 309), but some readers may not have this in mind. I hope that on a future occasion the relation of these pieces will be more fully discussed.

Pan's Anniversary. There is difficulty over the date of this masque, the '1625' of the folio being certainly wrong; and the editors have changed their mind about it. (The reference to their earlier view should be vol. ii, p. 324, not vol. i, p. 323.) They now suppose it to

¹ The editors note (following Sayle) that the factotum at the beginning of the 'Masques' section of the 1641 folio (to which we now pass) was used in 1634 by John Haviland. This is, so far as I know, the only clue to the printer of any part of the volume. It is perhaps interesting, though it can hardly be significant, that Haviland is reported to have acquired the business of William Stansby, the printer and publisher of the 1616 folio. Haviland is not heard of after 1638, but he was in partnership with Miles Fletcher, Robert Young, and Anne Griffin; and the business, which continued the old Eliot's Court Press, was carried on later by Anne and her son Edward Griffin the younger. It is possible, therefore, that they were the printers employed by Thomas Walkley for the 'third volume' of Jonson's Works.

² I notice that in vol. iv (p. 343) Mr. Simpson queried whether Digby was responsible for correcting the Greek of *Sejanus* in F2. So far as I am aware there is no evidence to connect Digby with any but the 'third volume'.

have been performed on 17 Jan. and 29 Feb. 1620. The year is given by a bill for properties (printed in *N. & Q.* in 1855; cf. ii. 324) which mentions the characters of the anti-masque. The closer dating rests on a summons for Jonson and the King's men to attend at court in January (see i. 235), which suggests identification with a masque recorded in the Venetian State Papers (see iii. 607). This, however, is conjecture, since no particulars appear to be given beyond the dates of performance. Curiously enough the editors add that Brotanek 'was the first to date the masque correctly'. But the date he proposed was 19 June 1620, James's birthday; and in view of the title of the piece and of the flower-strewing nymphs that introduce it, his conclusion seems difficult to question.¹ The folio date being wrong, the editors have moved the piece to an earlier position in the volume; but, believing it to have been performed in January 1620, what possessed them to place it after *News from the New World*, for which they presumably still accept Brotanek's date of 6 Jan. 1621, as they did in vol. ii (p. 311)? Or do they now propose to challenge this, on the ground that *News from the New World* must be the first masque that Jonson wrote after his return from Scotland (ii. 311, 324)? But Jonson cannot have written two masques for January 1620, so in that case they will after all have to accept Brotanek's date for *Pan's Anniversary*. This, I am inclined to think, is the true solution. There appears to be really no evidence that Jonson wrote the masque for January 1621; there is evidence that he wrote that for January 1620, but *Pan's Anniversary* does not fit the occasion. Presumably, therefore, *News from the New World* belongs to January 1620² and *Pan's Anniversary* to the following June. If that is so the editors' order is correct though it cannot be reconciled with their statements. They might have given the matter a little more consideration.

The Gypsies Metamorphosed. We are better supplied with authorities for this masque than for any other, and yet its text remains more than usually uncertain. There is in the first place the early Heber-Huntington manuscript, our prime authority. There is the duodecimo published by Benson in 1640; and the folio of 1641. There is also a later Newcastle-Harley manuscript. It is true that the last appears to be negligible: the editors describe it on p. 541 as a

¹ The most specific allusion is to 'The Garden-star, the Queene of May, The Rose'. Of course the botany must not be pressed; it would be difficult to find primroses and violets in flower at the same time as carnations and hollyhocks. But the whole setting seems to imply a spring or summer performance.

² In that case the date '1620' given in the folio of 1641 would be a calendar date, as we should expect (see *The Library* 1926, vi. 346).

'slavish copy' of the folio; but since it preserves some features lost in that text, they modify their view on p. 561, and assume it to have been transcribed from the manuscript that later served as copy for the folio. The folio, on the other hand, is an independent text, not a reprint of the earlier edition: furthermore, this earlier edition exists in two widely different states, which the editors distinguish, when necessary, as D₁ and D₂.¹ The second state is considerably enlarged. To accommodate the new matter Benson, we are told, 'had the original leaves D 6 to 10 and E 9 to 11 cancelled and two new sheets of twelve leaves, signatured "d" and "e", inserted in the text' (p. 552). This cannot be correct. He must have also cancelled the leaves E5-8; else the pagination could not run as reported, nor would the loss of these leaves in the Cambridge copy (which is our main authority for the other cancelled leaves) be 'deeply to be regretted'.²

The masque was performed three times, at Burley-on-the-Hill, at Belvoir Castle, and at Windsor, with alterations on each repetition. All the extant texts are conflated, and the main problem is to sort out the several versions. The editors make a valiant attempt to perform this task; but they are not completely successful, and I am not sure that the evidence is sufficient for a final solution. The Heber manuscript, they say, 'reads like a first attempt at the Windsor text, perhaps a copy written for presentation before the readings were finally adjusted' (p. 548). It may well be a presentation copy, and it seems to contain a text for the most part later than any other except the folio. But it is not homogeneous. In the earlier portion it appears to reproduce the original Burley version as its main text, since ll. 143-4 can obviously have been spoken nowhere else, and it gives variants for 'Beauer' and 'windsor': but later on portions of the main text belong no less obviously to Windsor (*e.g.* ll. 781-5). The folio, which is not only conflated but confused, does not, I think, aid materially in unravelling the several strands: it contains nothing of importance that is not in one or other of the better texts. Our other main authority is the duodecimo, which, as I have said, exists in two forms. 'Benson began by securing the text of the original performance at Burley-on-the-Hill' (p. 552). That it was mainly the

¹ However, in the collations to ll. 1291-1389 (a passage not in D₁) 'D' is used in error for 'D₂' (cf. ll. 557-700, where 'D₂' is used correctly); and I think that in ll. 1000-1273 (for which no copy of D₁ is known) it would also have been safer to use 'D₂' instead of 'D'.

² Mr. Strickland Gibson tells me that E5-8 have in fact been cancelled in Malone's copy of D₂.

Burley version is certain, but it is not so clear that it was uncontaminated. It would seem from the collations that D₁ (like D₂) has the Belvoir variant inserted after l. 1283. I do not altogether trust the collations at this point, for they are certainly confused and obscure; but D₁ also contains ll. 711-14, unless the collations are actually incomplete, and these lines appear to belong to Windsor. 'After the volume had been printed off, Benson obtained, certainly by dishonest means,¹ a copy of the fully revised and enlarged text used in the final performance at Windsor.' This is most likely true, since Benson (like the folio) printed two passages (ll. 663-77 and 1126-37) which are not in the Heber manuscript; but in that case we have to assume that he left the original version of the anti-masque standing on sigs. D₁₁-E₄, although his new manuscript contained substantial alterations—was, indeed, 'completely rewritten' according to the editors (p. 542)—for here the common D version is admittedly earlier than that found in the Heber manuscript and (with probably still later revisions) in the folio. I do not think that this is made sufficiently clear.²

In their endeavour to separate out the several versions the editors appear to have fallen into certain errors that tend to obscure an already complicated argument. Thus, we are told (p. 542) that the Burley text 'had the opening scene . . . (ll. 1-271)'. This should be 'll. 57-271': ll. 1-47 contain the prologues, the second of which belongs to Windsor. The concluding three lines of the King's fortune were not exactly 'afterwards cancelled': they were expanded into three stanzas. We are told (p. 545) that ll. 1291-1320 and ll. 1329-89 are Windsor additions. Presumably they are: but by the same token so are the eight intervening lines. The variant versions at ll. 155 ff., though correctly assigned in the manuscript, are at first sight puzzling, since the allusion to 'the Beauer ken' is in the Burley text and was omitted at Belvoir; but the editors in discussing them have not made matters clearer by apparently writing 'Belvoir' by a slip for 'Burley' on p. 556 (l. 13). The editors (p. 542) take the fortunes

¹ Why dishonest? His first manuscript, however obtained, was a very good one—'it may even have been autograph' (p. 553). The second was not so good, but the editors themselves suggest (p. 555) that there must have been a good many copies about; why should not one have come into Benson's hands in a perfectly normal way? He went to considerable trouble to give readers the full text.

² Nor do I understand the remark on p. 553 to the effect that in printing his cancels 'd' and 'e' Benson had 'to reinsert passages of the Burley text'. Surely the passages in question (those parallel in D₁ and D₂) must have stood in his second manuscript, just as they stand in the Heber manuscript. They are not specifically Burley text, they are common text. He had, of course, to reset them.

of the Countess of Rutland (ll. 460-78) and of the Countess of Exeter (ll. 479-90) to have been added at Belvoir. 'As hostess during the second party [Lady Rutland] had naturally stayed at home to prepare for it.' I wonder. 'This fortune is not in the early state of the Duo-decimo text'—on the contrary, it unquestionably is in D₁ according to the collations. There seems no reason whatever to suppose that it was not spoken at Burley. 'The Countess of Exeter's fortune is not found in either state of this text'—but the collations show that it is in D₂. It must have been spoken at Belvoir, if anywhere, since the ladies' fortunes were all omitted at Windsor. This proves that not all the additions in D₂ belong to the Windsor version. That they mostly do is evident; but there seems no actual proof that, for instance, the additional stanzas of the King's and Prince's fortunes were spoken there for the first time, as the editors assume (p. 544). It is merely a probability arising from the fact that the interval between the Burley and Belvoir performances on 3 and 5 August did not afford much time for revision, whereas a month elapsed before that at Windsor.

The editors have quite properly supplemented their copy-text from others where they are satisfied that it is incomplete. But where the texts are merely divergent, conflation is more questionable. The copy-text is allowed to stand except at one point (l. 924) where the editors insert from D, which here contains an earlier version, one phrase that they consider lends point to the text, as they explain on p. 559. It may, of course, have been accidentally omitted from the later versions; but personal predilection might suggest other tinkering, equally tempting and equally unwarranted.¹ Readers may wonder why in l. 844 the editors should have inserted a quite unnecessary 'must' from D: but here there is presumably evidence that the word has been lost through damage to the manuscript (cf. ll. 866-7, 680). It is bound to cause confusion if the editors insist on using the same typographical device to indicate both evident mutilations and hypothetical omissions.

Two facsimiles of the Heber manuscript are given. Checked by

¹ A better case could, for example, be made out for reading in ll. 941-2: 'and Francis Aldebreech has lost somewhat toot, besides her Mayden-head.', since here the addition comes from the folio, which apparently embodies revisions later than the Heber manuscript. Indeed, I am not sure that sufficient attention has been paid to the folio, which in the antimasque (ll. 744-999) is probably our only authority for the final text (except, of course, the closely related Newcastle manuscript, which, since it is *not* a transcript of the folio, may possess more importance than at first appears).

these the text shows two slight errors: l. 267 'fortune' should be italic, and l. 931 in 'wants' the 's' should be replaced by a contraction-mark (though I doubt whether the sort ought to be distinguished in this type of hand). The seven pages (615 ff.) of small type recording punctuation that the editors have added to the text are a monument to their conscientious care, but seem to me of doubtful value. The 'Manuscript has hardly any' stops (p. 562), and this statement might have sufficed. But if such a course was deemed too high-handed, surely the more economical plan would have been to print a list of the stops that *are* in the manuscript. It would also have avoided ambiguity or worse. Apostrophes are among the 'stops' whose insertion is recorded. Consequently at l. 934 'i' faith.' (the text has 'i'faith.') implies that both the apostrophe and the period have been supplied, though the former is actually present. This failure of critical discrimination would be hard to avoid on the method adopted. The list itself is not complete, if one may trust the facsimiles—which it is perhaps unfair to do. They suggest that in l. 277 the comma after 'lucke' is editorial, and in l. 938 the period after 'em'. The line number 922 should be 921, and 922 should appear before the next reading. The stops in the text have been supplied 'usually from the Duodecimo or the Folio' (p. 615). They are often superfluous; but Jonson's own punctuation was habitually overloaded.

In the last four masques, which they print from quartos, the editors have done a curious thing that strict criticism will hardly approve. Since the quartos have no head-title at the beginning of the text, they have supplied the deficiency from the folio; and they have not even enclosed the addition in brackets, as their general practice would seem to demand. This also leads to a quite illegitimate form of collation note. In three instances they explain (more or less) what they have done, but not in *Love's Triumph*, where moreover the folio head-title seems to have got conflated with the quarto title-page (separately reproduced).¹ In the introductory note to *The Fortunate Isles*² the editors cite without comment, but as referring to this piece, an entry quoted by Chalmers from Herbert's office book. In fact there is reason to suspect that Chalmers confused two distinct

¹ The date '1630' in the underline should be '1630-1', the performance having been on 9 Jan. 1631. In similar cases elsewhere the double date is given.

² The date '1626' in the folio head-title is an error for '1625', not for '1624' as the editors assume: the folio is trying to give calendar dates.

entries, and it is not certain that 'Mr. Jon' is Jonson.¹ In the note before *Chloridia* we are told that in the folio 'The names of "The Inventors. . ."' are added on the title-page after the date'. But the folio has only a head-title.

In the Blackfriars entertainment, the one piece for which we are dependent on a manuscript, the editors print in l. 229 the queer form 'where <ere>'. It may be merely a misprint: we have 'whosoe're' in *Hymenaei* (l. 720), and 'ere' = ever in *Sejanus* (I. 211).²

The Masque of Owles. I do not see why this piece need have been taken from among the masques and included in the entertainments. Of course, it is not a masque in the technical sense, but then neither are *Prince Henry's Barriers* and *A Challenge at Tilt* in the 1616 folio, nor strictly is the *Christmas* show in that of 1641. Something might have been said in supplement of the rather unsatisfactory account given in vol. ii (p. 330). The folio date 1626 is there (and here) corrected to 1624 on the evidence of a letter of John Chamberlain's, but it is not stated to what this evidence amounts. It is also implied that the 'grotesque characters' speak their own 'successive speeches', whereas it is clear that the only speaker is the presenter Captain Cox. What does 'The third varied' mean (l. 166)? It is printed as if part of the text, but suggests that the following description is an alternative to 'Owle third' (l. 116). One looks to the editors to determine such points.

The general introductory note on the text (pp. xxv-xxvii) contains one or two statements about the publications in question that are not quite accurate. Stansby entered the 'Masques at Court' in the Stationers' Register in 1615 not 1614; Bishop did not, strictly speaking, acquire his rights from Stansby's widow, but from Stansby himself under his own hand and seal, though the sale was registered with the widow's consent after his death; that Walkley was 'The true owner of the copyright' of all the later masques is perhaps too confident a statement; lastly, it was Crook and Sergier, not Benson, who registered *The Masque of Augurs*, *Time Vindicated*, *Neptune's Triumph* and *Pan's Anniversary*. Incidentally, I notice that the editors still speak of *The Underwoods* in the plural, in spite of what seem to me the convincing arguments advanced by Mr. B. H. Newdigate

¹ It appears that Chalmers actually printed 'Mr. Jon[son]', but it is not clear what he meant by the brackets, or what evidence he had for the expansion. Herbert would have been more likely to use the spelling 'Johnson'.

² In *Hymenaei* we also find 'e're' = before (ll. 531, 539, 545, 547), but 'ere' correctly in *Sejanus* (V. 335).

in favour of the singular form of this collective name, on the analogy of *The Forest and Timber* (or *Discoveries*).¹

I am a little disturbed at an increase in what appears to me the unseemly use of brackets in the text. Where some substantial addition has to be made to the copy-text, say a line or a speech or more, there is a good deal to be said for giving it some typographical distinction: but I deprecate reliance on diacritical marks as a regular device of editing; and unless *all* departures from the copy-text are similarly signalized the practice seems both inconsistent and misleading. In their general note on the text the editors write (p. xxvii): 'Conical brackets enclose words [or, much more often, letters] inserted in the text to supply an omission [or mend a mutilation] of the original; square brackets enclose a letter or word wrongly inserted in the original [*i.e.* which *is* in the original, but which the editors wish to remove].' I should like to submit that it is the duty of a critical editor to take the responsibility for such additions to and omissions from the copy-text as he feels compelled to make, as well as for other alterations, without disfiguring the page for the reader.

Let us for a moment examine how these brackets are used. Of the square variety not much need be said. When (p. 99) the quarto abbreviation 'Epi.' (which stood for 'Epigramma') was expanded in the folio to 'Epist.' an error was committed that an editor (if he insists on printing from the derivative text) must obviously correct. But I can see no advantage in printing 'Epi[st]' (it should in any case be 'Epi[st].') and offending at once the critical and æsthetic sense. Errors of the same type are in all probability 'pleasure[s]' (p. 769) and 'sig[h]nes' (p. 772), though the latter raises the question of permissible licence in spelling. The great majority of instances are

¹ Mr. Newdigate collected the evidence some years ago in a letter in *The Times Literary Supplement*, the date of which I unfortunately failed to note. I am able to supplement slightly the record he gave of the headlines. They are: *Underwoods* on pp. 164-8, 172-3, *Under-woods* on pp. 169-71, 174-207, *The Under-wood* on pp. 209-285; but some copies have the third variant already on pp. 201 and 208. This throws light on the manner of printing. Pages 172-3 are 2A2'-3', the inner forme of the inner sheet of quire 2A. That these pages carry on the headline of quire Z proves that they were imposed before the outer forme and before either forme of the outer sheet. This would be the normal procedure if the printer wanted to get on with the press work as quickly as possible. Again pp. 201 and 208 are the outer forme of the outer sheet of quire 2E. This would, on the same procedure, be the last forme of the gathering to be put on the press, and it was during the printing of this forme that the final version of the headline was adopted. That it was thought worth while to stop the press in order to make the alteration as early as possible (instead of waiting till the next quire) shows that the correction was regarded as important, and confirms the view that *The Underwood* is really the proper form of the title.

in fact spellings that it shocks the editors to see in Jonson's works, such as 'appar[r]el'd' (p. 755). The commonest of all are 'Brit[t]ain' and 'Brit[t]ish', because these, though not consistent, seem to be the usual forms in the extant texts. Whether they can be credited to Jonson himself I should not like to say; but on p. 803 both the folio and the Newcastle manuscript have 'Brittaines', and both may derive directly from the autograph. Moreover, the editors' practice is not consistent. On p. 529 they print 'Io[h]nson', on p. 749 'Jo[h]nson'; but on p. 735 'Ionson', with a note that the original has 'Johnson'. Again at p. 324, l. 33, they print 'decayd', not 'decay[e]d', where the copy-text has 'decayed', which after all there was little reason to alter.

The use of 'conical' brackets is far more frequent, and is on occasions misleading. On p. 171 'Ocean(i)ae' seems to imply an original 'Oceanae', whereas the collations show that the copy-text actually has 'Ocianae'. So on p. 723 we find 'keep'⟨st⟩, where the original has 'keepe'. These are no doubt correct according to the editors' practice, but are none the less confusing. Again there is some inconsistency. I have already remarked on head-titles supplied without brackets from another text. On p. 769 brackets and dots are used to indicate a missing line, on p. 13 a row of stars and no brackets. Sometimes the brackets are used for quite another purpose, namely, to indicate mutilations. Thus they appear in the marginalia to *Neptune's Triumph*, which are cropped in the only available copy of the quarto.¹

There is, of course, the further question how far the bracketed additions are really necessary. I feel a little doubtful about an emendation of Gifford's on p. 237 (printed '⟨t⟩is'), and if it is accepted still more doubtful about the change in punctuation. Is the 'We' introduced from F2 on p. 377, l. 19, really necessary? or the 'so' inserted on p. 609, l. 1325? I am not convinced that we need assume haplography either on p. 43, l. 52, or on p. 380, l. 111—though, of course, one expects trouble when Puck is about! Still more questionable seems to me the attempt to make the jargon of *The Irish Masque* consistent by printing 't[h]y', 't[h]at', 's⟨h⟩pend', 'mayshters⟨h⟩', 'honesh⟨t⟩', and so forth. Of course the editors blame the printer; but I should be surprised if the spelling in Jonson's manuscript was uniform. Even so, they do not appear to

¹ There is, however, another copy in the Huntington Library, which might perhaps have supplied the defects.

have been completely successful: in l. 93 they print 'be creesh s(h)aue me', in l. 133 'By creesh sa' me'. But perhaps the most frequent use of these brackets is in connexion with Jonson's peculiar practice of metrical elision. As this is a matter that happens to have lately engaged my attention, perhaps I may be allowed a short digression.

It is well known that graphically Jonson employed two forms of elision, both indicated by an apostrophe, but one omitting and one retaining the elided vowel. Thus, in his *English Grammar*, in the chapter 'Of Apostrophus', he gives as examples, not only 'Th'outward' and 'th'inward man', but 'If ye' utter' and 'if ye' once begin'. A search in the 1616 folio through *Sejanus*, of which, according to Mr. Simpson, Jonson carefully revised the proofs, reveals the following examples among others. Fully elided are:

'th'act' 'th'exalted' 'th'other' 'th'authority' &c. [but 'The' amazing' in Q, V. 221]
't'enforce' 't'inuest' 't'observe' 't'haue' &c. [but 'to' vndoe' I. 257]
'h'is' 'h'affected' 'h'had' 'h'would' [but 'He' hath' III. 318]
'she's' 'this's' 'that's' 'ther's'.

On the other hand we find:

'Augusta, 'is' 'vertue'; In' 'me', I' 'borrow' a man' 'Do' I see?'
'body' as' 'glory' inough' 'my' aduanced' [but 'm'instructions' V. 351]

and also:

'yo' were' 'yo' are' [but 'You' are' Q, V. 428]
'They' are' 'I' haue' 'be' our' 'be' amus'd'.

All these the editor reproduced (or in some instances introduced from the quarto). We find similar elisions in the texts of the present volume; p. 41 'you' her', p. 61 'they' are', p. 193 'stray'ing' and 'by' impulsion': but the use is not consistent; on p. 194 we have 'the' Elysian' and 'Th'Elysian' in consecutive lines, on p. 251 'he' hath' but on the next page 'H'hath'. These the editors leave standing. Taken as a whole the instances suggest that as a general rule Jonson omitted the vowel in all ordinary cases, but that where full elision would be either graphically or phonetically awkward he retained it, though nowhere is his practice very consistent. There is, I fancy, no greater subtlety in it than that.

Now, commenting on 'Jonson's use of the metrical apostrophe' (i.e. the incomplete elision) the editors very pertinently remark (p. 651) that a printer unversed in the author's habits would be likely

to omit either the vowel or what they call 'the accent'. They have themselves made no attempt to restore apostrophes where they suspect them to be missing, feeling perhaps that 'no<'> interpreter' and 'Folly<'> is' would look absurd; but on the other hand they have been lavish in supplying supposedly missing vowels. Sometimes there may be excuse for this. On p. 456 'th<ey>' are' and on p. 457 'the<y>' are' have the authority of 'They' are' in *Sejanus* and *Mortimer*. On p. 20 'wh<o>' have' may be allowed to pass, on the ground that full elision is awkward; and so perhaps on p. 486 may 'b<y>' vn-altered law', though it must be observed that the manuscript and the folio, which are independent and may be directly derived from the autograph, alike omit the 'y'. But all the other instances I have observed are opposed to Jonson's practice as it appears in *Sejanus*. In at least a dozen places the 'o' of 'to' has been restored (p. 44 't<o>' enjoy', p. 61 't<o>' assure', p. 738 't<o>' haue', &c.), though I can find only one instance of its presence in the play:¹ we also have on p. 353 the equally unsupported 'H<e>' is'. The worst instance perhaps is 'ther<e>'s' on p. 712, though on p. 129 'Ther's' is allowed to remain unaltered. I may also remark that Jonson's usual abbreviation of 'them' seems to have been 'hem', a fact that the editors recognize on p. 721 by printing '<h>em', though they leave 'em' standing on pp. 26, 465, 481, and elsewhere. Unless there is in all this some subtlety that escapes me, the editors' procedure seems wanton. Indeed, the editing throughout gives me a feeling of fussy interference, which I cannot but deplore.

The same faint suggestion of pedantry, though in an opposite direction, may be found in an increasing tendency to substitute methods of the facsimile reprint for those of critical editing. The retention of 'swash' italic capitals seems to be an innovation in the present volume. It serves, so far as I can see, no purpose, and has an untidy appearance. There are other trivial examples. In the folio of 1616, on the third page of *A Panegyre*, the article was accidentally omitted from the headline. Lest it should be supposed that they had overlooked this detail, the editors disfigure the third page of their own text with the heading '<A> Panegyre.' But since this does not correspond in contents with that of the folio, such a show of fidelity is merely specious. Indeed, the attempt in a critical edition to reproduce the form and typography of the original headlines seems

¹ The quarto of *Time Vindicated* has in l. 40 'To' exhibite', where the folio has 'T'exhibite'.

to me misconceived. In any case they are for the most part fictitious, the original being usually unprovided with them.

I should like to plead with the editors to be a little more precise and explicit in their statements. One knows from experience how easy it is, when a point is clear in one's own mind, to suppose that it will be equally clear to another's. But the safer course is to assume that if there is a possible loophole for misapprehension a reader will find it. To some cases of ambiguity I have already drawn attention: others could have been cited. On p. 163 the remark, 'There are five variations in the catchwords', is a little unfortunate, since 'No variants have been detected': what is meant is that five catchwords differ slightly from the following text. (Was there any particular reason for recording them in this instance and not in others?) To say (p. 267) that the manuscript of *The Masque of Queens* consists of 'twenty folios' is, of course, perfectly correct: but to have said that it consists of 'twenty quarto leaves' would have prevented possible misunderstanding. To be told (p. 269) that Jonson 'leaves out the *b* in "*subsequatur*"' sends the conscientious student to the text to discover which. No doubt readers of the statement (p. 270) that 'In the description of the House of Fame, "in the vpper part of w^h were discovered the twelue *Masquers*" is changed to "in the top of which"' will understand what is meant, but this is obviously not what is said. There are several instances of this loose way of indicating alterations. On p. 275 'The blank A 1 . . . is found in the Huntington copy with a cancel title-page' would naturally be taken to imply that this title differed from that found elsewhere. In fact (as later appears) the title is the same and a cancel in all copies, and the presence of the blank is irrelevant. (To be quite strict, 'a cancel title-page' is nonsense: only a leaf, not a page, can be a cancel.) A few lines later: 'The Quarto title corresponds verbally with that of the holograph'—with the trifling exception that it bears an imprint! Page 74: 'Many of the variants are not a press-correction, but a resetting.'!

This looseness of expression extends unfortunately to the collations, where if anywhere mathematical precision is desirable. Thus in *Christmas his Masque*, ll. 110-12, 'the heading "*VEN.*" supplied by the Editor' clearly implies that the original wants the speaker's name: it is only on referring back to l. 102 that we realize that 'Ven[us].' has been substituted for 'Woman.' There are several instances in *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*, where the collations are,

of course, unusually complicated. A few are definitely wrong. At l. 866 the speaker's prefix '*Town.*' is required in the lemma. At ll. 779-92 I suspect that the two words following the lemma should be omitted, but the error may be a more complex one. Others are obscure. Thus at one point (l. 297) we find 'Highe! beautifull! iust! *Dr* (High!)'. Knowing that the manuscript copy-text is almost devoid of punctuation, it becomes clear on reflection that what is meant is that the 'shrieks' have been supplied from *D*₁, but that this omits the 'e' of 'Highe'. However, this use of parentheses (which seems to me hardly worth while) is exceptional and is not explained. At another point (l. 1285) the text reads 'If not a holie night,' and the collation 'If not *MS, Dr*'. It took me some time to guess that what was meant was that *D*₂ and *F* have 'For 'tis', the reading of the Belvoir version (l. 1281): indeed it was only by consulting *F* that I reached this conclusion. Again at ll. 258-9 we are offered the collation: '*om. MS. (in which it is the last line of p. 10)*'. Is it hypercritical to suggest (1) that two lines are not one line, (2) that a non-existent line cannot be a last line, and (3) that the number of the page is irrelevant? Take lastly a collation on p. 603: 'After 1125 *Added in D, F in italics*'. 'After 1125' is clumsy for '1126-37', and the mention of italics is quite misleading, since it suggests that these lines are typographically differentiated from the rest, whereas in fact the whole passage (ll. 1062-1137) is printed in italic in *F*, and presumably in *D*. The recording of types is usually just irrelevant and distracting; and since it was dispensed with in the 'simplified' collations to *The Masque of Queens* (see p. 274), it could presumably have been dispensed with elsewhere.

Students of Jonson have become accustomed to the patient labour which the present editors invariably devote to securing the minute accuracy of their texts, but I think that special recognition is due to the time and eyesight that must have been lavished on the small type of Jonson's marginal commentary—though here again I wonder whether it was not a mistake to follow the inconvenient typographical arrangement of the original. A word of praise should also be given to the illustrations. The half-tone facsimiles of manuscripts are perhaps not all one could wish, but the collotype plates are excellent. It was a happy thought to preface the volume with the admirable grisaille portrait of Inigo Jones at Kelston Park—it would so have infuriated Jonson! To *Hymenaei* belongs the elaborate painting of the rather forbidding lady masquer at Welbeck Abbey. None of Jones's drawings

are reproduced here: five are in vol. ii, and the Chatsworth collection is, of course, accessible with Mr. Simpson's commentary. Harrison's *Arches of Triumph* supplies a couple of very accomplished engravings, by Kip the cartographer, of two erections, 'Londinium' and 'Templum Iani', for which Jonson wrote verses as his part of *The King's Entertainment*.

Something too should be said of the achievement of the Clarendon Press, which has produced this bulky volume without any indication of the difficulties of the times. The only hint of anything unusual is that it has apparently not been possible to obtain the same binding cloth as before, but the one now substituted is not only closely similar, but actually an improvement on the old.

THE PROGRESS OF ERROR:

MRS. CENTLIVRE AND THE BIOGRAPHERS

BY JAMES R. SUTHERLAND

Nothing but experience could evince the frequency of false information, or enable any man to conceive that so many groundless reports should be propagated, as every man of eminence may hear of himself. Some men relate what they think, as what they know; some men of confused memories and habitual inaccuracy, ascribe to one man what belongs to another; and some talk on, without thought or care. A few men are sufficient to broach falsehoods, which are afterwards innocently diffused by successive relaters.

DR. JOHNSON.

Anyone who has had experience of collecting materials for a biography must often have been surprised at the tangle of inconsistent statements which his labours have brought to light. No less surprising is the hardy persistence from one biographer to another of facts which are demonstrably false, and which in their gradual descent have acquired an authority based on nothing more than their frequent repetition. There are other facts which began as plausible conjectures and soon hardened into certainties. There are facts, again, true enough as they were originally expressed, but which in the course of transmission have been enlarged upon by carefree and imaginative biographers until they result in statements for which no authority can be found and none is ever offered. The several methods by which such clots of unreliable statement are accumulated are so interesting to the scholar and to the student of human nature that it is worth while making a detailed examination of the process. Laziness, inaccuracy, slipshod expressions, dishonesty, facetiousness, a love of the picturesque, and, above all, a desire to say something where there was little to be said, all these are fruitful begetters of biographical error.

The progress from bad to worse may be well seen in the successive accounts, from the reign of George I to the present day, of Mrs. Susanna Centlivre. This lady, author of *The Busy Body*, *The Wonder*, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, and sixteen other plays, was well enough

known, indeed something of a celebrity, in her own generation. When Farquhar died in 1707, and Steele transferred his attention from writing plays to writing essays, she could fairly lay claim to being the leading comic dramatist of Queen Anne's reign. One of the few certain facts about her, apart from her authorship of the nineteen plays, is that she died on December 1, 1723, and was buried three days later in St. Paul's, Covent Garden.¹ It would not have been surprising if Edmund Curll, who had already begun to issue his post mortem pamphlets, had given the world some account of a lady who had been one of his authors and whose career contained excellent material for popular biography; but for some reason Curll left her at peace. There are two contemporary accounts, however, which have some show of honesty, and which were at least written from respectable motives. The first of these appears in Giles Jacob's *Poetical Register*, 1719, some years before her death.

This Gentlewoman, now living, is Daughter of one Mr. *Freeman*, late of *Holbeach*, in *Lincolnshire*, who married a Daughter of Mr. *Marham*, a Gentleman of good Estate at *Lynn Regis*, in the County of *Norfolk*. There was formerly an Estate in the Family of her Father; but he being a Dissenter, and a zealous Parliamentarian, was so very much persecuted at the Restoration, that he was necessitated to fly into *Ireland*, and his Estate was confiscated: Nor was the Family of her Mother free from the Severities of those Times, they being likewise Parliamentarians. Her Education was in the Country; and her Father dying when she was but three Years of Age; and her Mother not living till she was twelve, what Improvements she has made, have been meerly by her own Industry and Application. She was married before the Age of Fifteen to a Nephew of Sir *Stephen Fox*. This Gentleman living with her but a Year, she afterwards married Mr. *Carrol*, an Officer in the Army: And survived him likewise, in the space of a Year and half. She is since married to Mr. *Joseph Cent Livre*, Yeoman of the Mouth to his present Majesty. She was inclined to Poetry when very Young, having compos'd a Song before she was Seven Years old. . . .²

This account cannot be lightly set aside. It was Jacob's proud boast that most of the accounts of the living authors 'came from their own Hands', and it is difficult to see who but Mrs. Centlivre herself is likely to have told him that she had written a song before she was seven years old. But if she gave Jacob his facts she did not necessarily tell him the truth, or all the truth; she may only have told him what she was willing that the world should know.

¹ *Registers of St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden*, vol. iv, p. 281.

² *The Poetical Register: or, The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1719, pp. 31-2.

That one is bound to examine Jacob's statements carefully, and even sceptically, becomes apparent when one considers the second of the two contemporary accounts. This is a short obituary notice in Abel Boyer's *Political State of Great Britain*.

The same Day, died also Mrs. *Susannah Centlivre*, Wife to *Joseph Centlivre*, one of the Yeomen of the Kitchen to his Majesty. Her Father's Name, if I mistake not, was *Rawkins*, her first Husband's, *Carol*. From a mean Parentage, and Education, after several gay Adventures (over which we shall draw a Veil) she had, at last, so well improved her natural Genius, by Reading and good Conversation, as to attempt to write for the Stage; in which she had as good Success, as any of her Sex before her. . . .¹

What is one to make of Rawkins? Almost all Mrs. Centlivre's later biographers have either ignored him in favour of the far more impressive Mr. Freeman who had an estate, or, more innocently, have never met with Boyer's brief account in the *Political State*. But there is good evidence to show that Boyer's memory had not played him false; for when Susanna Carroll became Susanna Centlivre on April 23, 1707, she was described in the marriage register as 'Susanna Carroll *alias* Rawkins'.² Rawkins, therefore, was almost certainly her maiden name; it is highly improbable that the bride-to-be would endanger the validity of her marriage by making or countenancing a false entry in the marriage register. What, then, was her relationship, if any, with Mr. Freeman of Holbeach? She may possibly have been his illegitimate daughter, and Rawkins and his wife—people of 'mean parentage'—the couple to whom she was farmed out in her infancy. Certainly Mr. Freeman, or, at any rate, Holbeach, has to be reckoned with, for in later life Mrs. Centlivre more than once stayed at or near Holbeach.³

¹ *Op. cit.*, vol. xxvi (December 1723), pp. 670-1.

² *Registers of St. Bene't and St. Peter Paul's Wharf, London*, vol. II, p. 67. I have not consulted the original register, but I have assumed that the 'Susanna Caroll^{ies} Rawkins' of the printed register is, in fact, 'Susanna Carroll *alias* Rawkins'. She appears to have had a son by Carroll. See *MSS. of the House of Lords: New Series*, vol. VII (1706-8), pp. 21-2; L.J., vol. XVIII, p. 220.

³ In a poem, 'From the Country, to Mr. Rowe in Town, MDCCXVIII.' (*A New Miscellany of Original Poems* . . . 1720, p. 326) she says that she is writing 'From a lonesome Old House, near Holbeach, Wash-way'. At Holbeach in June 1716, on George I's birthday, Mrs. Centlivre invited 'all the widows that take Collections of the Parish, to the tavern to Supper, where she caus'd them to drink King George's Health on their Knees, then the Prince and Princess, and all the Royal Family; the Duke of Marlborough, Lord Townshend, Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Walpole, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Duke of Argyle, and Gen. Cadogan etc. The Musick playing in the Room, and the bells ringing by her Orders all Supper Time, and the windows of the Room illuminated; the old Women Danc'd and were exceedingly rejoyc'd, and the whole Town was in an Uproar. . . .' (*The Flying Post*, June 21-23, 1716). It must have been a hilarious evening. A

Two other early accounts deserve attention, though not perhaps so much attention as they have received. The first of these occurs in 'A Compleat List of all the English Dramatic Poets', appended to Thomas Whincop's *Scanderbeg*, 1747. If, as is now generally believed, this list was compiled by John Mottley, this account of Mrs. Centlivre should have some value, since Mottley assisted her with her comedy, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, and must therefore have been acquainted with her. Here, at any rate, the Centlivre legend is notably augmented. Jacob had said that her father died when she was three, and her mother when she not yet twelve; Mottley reverses the order. Not only does he say that her father survived her mother, but that he married a second time. On his death Susanna was so ill treated by her stepmother that 'she determined to come to London, with very little Money in her Purse, and almost destitute of every Necessary of Life, to seek a better Fortune than she was likely to obtain at home under a cruel Step-dame'.¹ As to this, one cannot but remark that the cruel stepmother is one of the stock figures of folk lore; but though one may suspect Mottley's story one is not entitled to reject it merely because it looks suspicious. It is odd, however, that it should contradict Jacob's version so completely. There follows a picturesque narrative of how she was found on the roadside by a young gentleman.

She had not travelled many Miles, but fatigued with her Journey and filled with a thousand perplexing Thoughts, she sat her down, with Tears in her Eyes, on a Bank by the Side of the Road, bewailing her lamentable Condition, when a young Gentleman from the University of Cambridge [Anthony Hammond Esq;] afterwards well known in the Polite World, chancing to come that Way, could not but take Notice of our weeping Damsel, then in the Bloom of Youth and Beauty, not quite fifteen Years of Age, her Charms not diminished but rather heightened by her Tears: having enquired into the Cause of her Distress, he was so much moved with her Story, and the simple and affecting manner in which she related it, and more especially with her lovely Shape and Features, that he found himself so attached to her Person and Interest, that he could not think of parting with her, and of suffering her to pursue her painful Journey in the Condition she was in; he therefore intreated her to put herself under his Protection, which after some modest but faint Reluctance she consented to.

similar junketing took place in her house at Buckingham Court two years later (*The Weekly Journal; Or, British Gazetteer*, June 7, 1718). Edward Freeman of Holbeach in the County of Lincoln, Yeoman, whose will, dated March 4, 1673, was proved on June 23, 1674, left to his daughter, Susanna, twenty shillings. She was apparently the youngest of his six surviving children (Miscellaneous Lincoln Wills, A.68, Probate Registry, Lincoln).

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

Hammond (Mottley continues) took her to a village not far from Cambridge, dressed her in boy's clothes, and afterwards introduced her to his college as 'Cousin *Jack*, who was come to see him at the University'. Jack learnt to fence, and 'because the young Rogue had a Mind to be a Man before his Time, when the Barber shaved his Cousin, he must perform his Office likewise on him, not that *Jack* had a Beard, but he wanted one'. Hammond also 'took a good deal of Pains to teach him a little Grammar. He instructed him also in some of the Terms of Logic, Rhetoric, and Ethics'. After some months of this, the affair 'began to be smoked in the College', and Hammond took steps to get rid of her. He sent her to London with 'a very handsome Present in Gold', and 'she saw him not in many Years after'.¹ Later, she met 'Mr. *Fox*, a Nephew of the late Sir *Stephen Fox*', and 'to this Gentleman she was married, or something like it, in the sixteenth Year of her Age'.²

Mottley is only too obviously anxious to tell a lively story, but it may have been based on the truth, or what he believed to be, or what he thought might easily be, the truth. That Mrs. Centlivre had some acquaintance with Anthony Hammond in later years seems to be indicated by the fact that he included some of her verses in his *New Miscellany of Original Poems*, 1720. But again Mottley's narrative is open to suspicion. It is significant that he does not vouch for the truth of the Cousin Jack episode; he prefaces it with the facetious remark, 'If we may give Credit to some private stories concerning her she had for a short Time a kind of University Education.' The episode itself is plausible enough, and may have been one of those 'several gay Adventures' over which Boyer was willing to draw a veil; but the account of how Hammond taught the girl Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, and Ethics has an air of being designed to explain how this uneducated young person could proceed in a few years to write plays. When Mottley writes about what he really knows the tone is different. 'If she had not a great deal of Wit in her Conversation', he says, 'she had much Vivacity and good Humour; she was remarkably good-natured and benevolent in her Temper, and ready to do any friendly Office as far as it was in her Power.' And again:

She lived in a decent clean Manner, and could shew . . . a great many Jewels and Pieces of Plate, which were the Product of her own Labour. . . .³

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 185-6.

² *Ibid.*, p. 188.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

The other early account is that given in *The British Theatre*, 1750. If, as seems likely, this was the work of W. R. Chetwood, it has some claim to serious attention, for Chetwood was a contemporary of Mrs. Centlivre's and prompter for twenty years at Drury Lane. Here again her father is said to be Mr. Freeman. Her education, however, was

intirely owing to her own Industry, and the Assistance of a neighbouring *French Gentleman*, who so much admired her sprightly Wit and Manner, that he undertook to instruct her in the *French Language*, wherein she made such a rapid Progress, that she could, before she was twelve Years of Age, read *Moliere*, with all the Vivacity and distinguished Characters of the Drama.

The cruel stepmother reappears, and, as in Mottley's account, the girl is driven to seek refuge in flight. But this time there is no Anthony Hammond.

At the Time she had formed this Resolution, a Company of Strolling Players came to Stamford, where she joined them, with little Persuasion, and set out with the Part of *Parisatis*, in the Play of *Alexander the Great*: But having a greater Inclination to wear the Britches, than the Petticoat, she struck into the Men's Parts . . .

We shall drop her various *Marriages and Amours*. . . ¹

Here again one may detect some anxiety to explain how Mrs. Centlivre came by her education. It is significant, too, that she should again be put into breeches, though the transformation is effected in a different fashion. (Mottley, however, relates how she joined a strolling company some time after she had begun writing plays, and how she acted the part of Alexander the Great at Windsor in 1706, where Joseph Centlivre saw her and fell in love with her.)² There is, of course, nothing improbable in Susanna Freeman or Rawkins running away to join a company of strolling players: the same story is told of Richard Estcourt,³ and he—the better to disguise himself—played *female* parts.

Taken by itself, any one of those four accounts is plausible enough; it is when one tries to combine them that the trouble begins. Already one is faced with divergent statements about the name of the girl's father and his social status; about her age when her father and mother died, and which of her parents died first; about the existence of her stepmother; about the adventures she met with when she ran away from home—if, indeed, she ran away at all.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 140-1.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

³ W. R. Chetwood, *A General History of the Stage*, 1749, p. 140.

Most of the later accounts appear to be based mainly on Jacob and Mottley, though several of the modern biographers show that they are not unaware of the brief statements about Mrs. Centlivre by Boyer and the author of *The British Theatre*. Faced with the necessity of deciding between one authority and another (if authority is not here too grand a word), Mrs. Centlivre's biographers have accepted or rejected the early accounts more or less at random. The cruel stepmother turns up almost invariably, and so too does Anthony Hammond. The 'neighbouring French Gentleman' who taught her French makes only infrequent appearances, perhaps because the account in *The British Theatre* was not generally known, but more probably because he does not bear comparison with Anthony Hammond in picturesqueness. Sometimes a new twist is given to the events by a biographer who has either read the early accounts hurriedly, or has decided to combine them in his own fashion. The cruelty of the stepmother, for instance, began (as Mottley was careful to explain) only after the death of her father, whose first wife had died nine years earlier. In an early nineteenth century version,¹ however, these facts are re-arranged to form a different pattern:

Before she had completed her twelfth year she lost her mother, from whom, as her works abundantly testify, she must have received, even with her innate genius, the elements of an education conducted with no ordinary solicitude and skill. Her father married a second time, but her situation grew so unhappy with her stepmother, that . . . she resolved to go to London, conscious of possessing endowments that would help her to fortune. At this time her father was again residing in England, and it happened in the course of her elopement from his house. . . . [Here follows the story of Anthony Hammond.]

Here elements from Jacob appear to have been combined with others from Mottley; but whether deliberately or as the result of muddle-headedness it is hardly possible to say. The resulting statement, at any rate, differs from any that had hitherto been made.

On various matters which were left unsettled in the earliest accounts later biographers have pronounced confidently and to their own satisfaction. How old was Mrs. Centlivre when she died? When was she born? Of our four early accounts only one gives any clue to her age. 'She died in her third Husband's House', says the author of *The British Theatre*, 'in 1723, in the 56th year of her age.'²

¹ John Galt, *The Lives of the Players* (1831); 2nd ed. 1886, p. 75.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 141.

If this is so, she was born about 1667, and was over thirty when her first play was produced. In 1761, however, the female author of the scrappy life prefixed to the collected edition of Mrs. Centlivre's plays, states that 'her Death . . . happened in 1722, when she was near forty-five Years old.'¹ If this account is to be accepted, she was born about 1678, and would therefore have been only twenty-two when her first play was produced. Later biographers have rung the changes between 1667, 1677, and 1680.²

Where was she born—England or Ireland? Here again only *The British Theatre* among the four earliest accounts ventures upon a definite assertion. She was born, we are told, 'in Lincolnshire'.³ Jacob, it will be remembered, while saying nothing at all about her birthplace, had stated that her father 'was necessitated to fly into Ireland' after the Restoration. If Freeman fled from Holbeach in 1660, or shortly after that date, it seems unlikely that his daughter was born in England. Among later biographers, however, the division of opinion—for it is no more than that—has been in favour of Holbeach as the birthplace. Holbeach is, after all, a small English town, the sort of place where an English dramatist *might* have been born; it had been named in the earliest account of all as the home of her father. Why look elsewhere?⁴ The French editor of *The Wonder*, on the other hand, claims that she was born in Ireland, though Mr. Freeman (it is explained) returned to England, 'où l'amnistié, publiée par Charles, rapelloit tous les fugitifs'.⁵ It is this sort of statement which haunts the responsible biographer. He is all but certain that the statement about Mr. Freeman's return from Ireland is based on nothing more than intelligent deduction, but can he be quite sure that this particular biographer had not access to some source of information which he has not located? Again, a nineteenth century biographer states that 'her father is supposed to have been a respectable farmer living in the north of Ireland',⁶ and a twentieth century one says simply that she was 'born in Dublin'.⁷ According

¹ *The Dramatic Works of the Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre* (Pearson's reprint, 1872), vol. 1, p. xii.

² Eg. 1667: *Biographia Britannica*, 2nd ed., 1784, vol. III, p. 412. 1677: *Temple Bar*, vol. LI, p. 248. 1680, or 'about 1680': *Oeuvres de Mistriss Susanna Centlivre. Le Prodigé, ou La Femme Discrete*, 1785, p. 3.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴ None of her biographers has noted a letter which appeared in *The Flying Post*, June 21–23, 1716, where the writer refers to 'Mrs. Centlivre, who was Born at Holbeach'. This letter has considerable biographical interest. Cf. also *The Flying Post*, May 10–12, 1716.

⁵ *Le Prodigé, ou La Femme Discrete*, p. 3.

⁶ E. O. Blackburne, *Illustrious Irishwomen*, 1877, vol. II, p. 5.

⁷ S. J. Brown, *A Guide to Books on Ireland*, 1912, p. 164.

to yet another writer, her father was 'a dissenting minister'.¹ Here, perhaps, one can see a hasty deduction drawn from the fact that Mr. Freeman was, in the words of Jacob, 'a Dissenter, and a zealous Parliamentary' who had been forced to fly from his native town.

Such conflicting statements as those, almost invariably expressed without a trace of hesitation and with no indication of their source, will not surprise anyone who is familiar with the ways of popular biography. The popular biographer knows very well that his readers will be repelled by academic hesitations, and that they are not interested in scrupulous admissions that the evidence is far from certain. He knows that what is expected of him is a confident assertion—so authoritatively delivered that he will not be required to cite any authorities in support. To admit that 'some writers say she was born at Holbeach, but other accounts favour the north of Ireland' would only destroy that trust in the author's omniscience which the plain man likes to feel.

Where facts are available but scanty, the biographer's temptation is, of course, to embroider. This may be innocent enough, and in its simpler manifestations comparatively harmless; but before long conjecture will be found sliding almost imperceptibly into fact. The early accounts of Mrs. Centlivre's first and second marriages had done little more than name the husbands, the nephew of Sir Stephen Fox who died within a year of her marriage, and Captain Carroll who was killed in a duel within eighteen months. Mottley, it is true, had introduced some colour by suggesting that the first marriage was only a liaison, and by going so far as to say that the death of Captain Carroll was 'a sensible Affliction to her'.² But the French editor of *The Wonder* will have none of this English understatement. Of the first husband he writes: 'Après un an d'une union très-heureuse, elle eut le malheur de perdre son époux.' Soon afterwards, 'elle épousa le Capitaine Carrol, qui étoit devenu éperduement amoureux d'elle. Carrol, naturellement emporté, eut une querelle avec un de ses camarades, & fut tué en duel. . .'.³ Here one can almost see the facts growing before one's eyes. How did this writer know whether her first marriage was 'tres-heureuse' or not? Is the happiness anything more than a plausible deduction based upon the short duration of the marriage? If he had really known about Mrs. Centlivre's first marriage one would have expected him to know a

¹ *Memoirs of Celebrated Female Characters*. By Mrs. Pilkington, 1804.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.

good deal more; but his account adds nothing to our knowledge of Mrs. Centlivre that has not, like this, the air of being only amiable guess-work. Carroll was 'naturellement emporté'—for no better reason, one suspects, than that young soldiers who are killed in duels are obviously passionate men.

A late tradition reports that Mrs. Centlivre married these two men against the wishes of their families. This I cannot trace further back than Mrs. Inchbald. In her preface to an edition of *The Busie Body* (1808)¹ she writes of the years following Carroll's death:

It was now discreet to think on other support than such as had depended on the lives of two young husbands, who, having offended their family by a contract of marriage, the mere effect of love, had, on their demise, left their relict in the most indigent circumstances. Mrs. Carrol became an actress. . . .

Mrs. Inchbald had started another ball rolling. In 1877 this new tradition is still active:

Her worldly affairs were not very flourishing either, for her youthful husband had married her against the consent of his family, who would not therefore do anything for the young widow.²

Such statements as these may be true—indeed, they have a good chance of being true, since they were probably based on the author's knowledge of human nature—but they may equally well be false.

The accounts of Mrs. Centlivre's personal appearance show the same inclination in her biographers to embroider upon such statements as are available. Whatever the truth may be here, the years have been kind to her; age is so far from having withered her that a belief in her beauty may even be said to have grown up after her death. On this point Jacob, writing of the living dramatist, was perhaps necessarily silent; and Boyer, if he remembered her as a beauty, had nothing to say about that in his *Political State*. The author of *The British Theatre* contributed only the information that 'she had a small Wen on her left Eye lid, which gave her a Masculine Air'.³ It was Mottley, in his romantic account of the early escapade with Anthony Hammond, who first drew the world's attention to her beauty. Not much attention need be paid to the witty compliments addressed to her by Farquhar and Boyer in *Letters of Wit, Politicks and Morality* (1701), for these are letters of gallantry and follow an established convention. It may be that Susanna Freeman

¹ *The British Theatre; or A Collection of Plays* . . ., 1808, vol. xi.

² E. O. Blackburne, *Illustrious Irishwomen*, vol. II, p. 7.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 141.

was as lovely as Mottley's words are intended to suggest; but two uncomplimentary references to her personal appearance which seem to have escaped notice hardly give that impression. The first occurs in a satirical poem, *The Players turn'd Academicks* (1703). After some caustic remarks about Mrs. Pix, the author deals with Mrs. Centlivre, or, as she then was, Mrs. Carroll:

While *Carrol*, her Sister-Adventurer in Print,
Took her leave all in Tears, with a *Curt'sie* and *Squint*. . . .

The second reference is in *A Letter from the Dead* Thomas Brown to the *Living* Heraclitus (1704):

The first was a lean Gentlewoman, Mrs. *P-x*, Caterer to the Playhouse in Little Lincolns Inn Fields, the second a thundring piece of Man's Flesh, one Mrs. *T-tt*; the third, a Lady that never look'd a skew in her Life, one Mrs. *C-r-l*.

Since Mrs. Pix's corpulence was notorious (she was unkindly said to be 'big enough to be the Mother of the Muses'), and since Catherine Trotter was 'celebrated for beauty in her youth', and was 'small in stature', it seems fair to assume that the reference to Mrs. Carroll is as ironical as the other two, and that she had a noticeable, if not indeed a pronounced, squint. Perhaps 'a small Wen on her left Eye lid' is a more accurate way of describing the deformity from which she appears to have suffered, but Mottley's glowing description of her loveliness must surely be open to suspicion. Nevertheless it has proved the basis for all subsequent accounts of her beauty. Mrs. Inchbald (who believed that Mrs. Centlivre was born in Ireland and grew up there) writes of her being so much persecuted 'on account of her poverty and her beauty' that, flying from her enemies as her father had done before her, she 'took shelter in England'. She became an actress, but 'notwithstanding her youth, her wit, and her beauty, she was unsuccessful in that profession.'¹ In his brief account John Galt mentions her beauty no less than three times ('her youth, beauty, and enterprise'; 'her wit and beauty'; 'her spirit and beauty were, indeed, highly celebrated'). It was 'with the aid of her wit and beauty', he says, that 'she soon solaced her widowhood by a second marriage';² and here perhaps we have the chief reason why her biographers are so determined to dwell upon her good looks. A lady who was three times married must surely, it is felt, have been handsome. More simply, if one approaches

¹ Preface to *The Busie Body*, in *The British Theatre*, vol. xi.

² *The Lives of the Players*, 2nd ed., 1886, pp. 75, 76.

the writing of biography in the spirit of romance one will almost certainly decide that a heroine must be beautiful, unless there is decided evidence to the contrary.

The general tendency to exaggerate comes out in the insistence (nowhere warranted by her earliest biographers) that on the death of Captain Carroll she was left destitute, and so was driven to act on the stage and later to write for it. In his *Biographia Dramatica* Baker had made the modest suggestion that 'partly perhaps to divert her melancholy [on the death of Captain Carroll], but chiefly, it is probable, for the means of support, she now applied to her pen'.¹ The *Biographia Britannica* accepted this conjecture, but continued wisely to treat it as a conjecture. After Carroll's death, it was observed, she took to writing plays, 'to which she was probably in some measure induced by the narrowness of her circumstances'.² To Mrs. Inchbald such tentative statements must have been a betrayal of biography. When she came to write her own account of Mrs. Centlivre there were no such timid conjectures:

To avoid the alternative, female profligacy, or domestic drudgery, she now encountered the masculine enterprise of an author.³

Fortified by this confident and impressive pronouncement, later biographers have seen their way quite clearly. For John Galt, writing in 1831, conjecture has hardened into fact:

The straitened circumstances in which he [Carroll] had bequeathed her to the world, roused her latent genius, and animated those talents for literature which have so brilliantly inscribed her name amongst the most illustrious dramatic writers of England. Alike to divert her melancholy and to improve her scanty means of livelihood, she had recourse to her pen. . . .⁴

It may be objected that the examples which have been cited are drawn from an old bad sort of biography which did not survive the nineteenth century. But this old bad biography is still full of life. That the Centlivre legend has not stopped growing may be seen from at least two accounts written less than fifteen years ago.

A very muddled and inaccurate biography of Mrs. Centlivre appeared in Lewis Melville's *In the Days of Queen Anne* (1929). Here several odd additions are made to the Centlivre story. Of Captain Carroll we are told:

¹ *Op. cit.*, ed. 1812, vol. 1, pt. i, p. 98.

² *Op. cit.*, 2nd ed., 1784, vol. III, p. 412.

³ Preface to *The Busy Body*, in *The British Theatre*, vol. XI.

⁴ *The Lives of the Players*, 1886, p. 75.

The young husband met his death in a duel, it is said, with a man by the name of Wilkes.¹

It is said—but by whom? So far as I am aware, this is the first appearance of the man Wilkes, though no doubt it will not be the last. Of Mrs. Centlivre's meeting with her third husband this writer remarks:

An introduction was effected, and such good use did the man of pastry make of his opportunities that on December 1, 1723, the fair Susannah became his bride.²

It is perhaps unkind to point out that the biographer has got his notes mixed: on December 1, 1723, Mrs. Centlivre became, like Juliet, Death's bride. More characteristic of his general treatment of fact is the following passage:

Such histrionic displays as she indulged in after the marriage were all confined to the country, and gradually grew fewer in number as the claims of her pen usurped more and more of her time.³

Where did this writer find any evidence of Mrs. Centlivre's having acted after her marriage to Joseph Centlivre? Almost certainly he knew of none. There is no record of her having ever acted in London, and it is most improbable that the wife of Joseph Centlivre, one of Her Majesty's chief cooks, would continue to knock about the country with a company of strollers. The whole statement appears to have been made not so much for the purpose of saying something as to fill up space. But such statements are more dangerous than honest error; a slip can be detected and put right, but half-truths, and plausible conjectures disguised as fact, are more difficult to bring to book.

The very same tendency to go beyond the evidence available, and so to elevate conjecture into fact, is to be found in a still more recent re-hash of the Centlivre story. Writing of Joseph Centlivre, the author of this account remarks:

Mrs. Centlivre's friends could never forgive her for having married a mere cook.⁴

Which friends? What were their objections, and where are those to be found? If there is any evidence for such a statement I have not met with it. Has this writer, yawning over his task, unluckily recollected the Inchbald assertion that Mrs. Centlivre's first and second husbands had offended their families by 'a contract of marriage, the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 212.

² *Ibid.*, p. 213.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

⁴ 'The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre,' *Neophilologus*, 1931, vol. xvi, p. 272.

mere effect of love'? Or has he simply assumed that Mrs. Centlivre's friends—Steele, Rowe, Mrs. Bracegirdle and the rest—would not care to be acquainted with a cook's wife? No doubt the English attitude to cooks is imperfectly civilized, and Pope made use of this fact for satirical ends when he referred to Mrs. Centlivre as 'the cook's wife in Buckingham-court'.¹ But Joseph Centlivre was not 'a mere cook'; he was a person of some importance in the Queen's household, earning a salary of £60 per annum. Had the writer just quoted reversed his judgment and said that 'Mr. Centlivre's friends could never forgive him for having married a mere strolling actress', he might perhaps have been nearer the truth.

In Mottley's account, Anthony Hammond's 'cousin Jack' proceeded from Cambridge to London with a letter of recommendation to 'a Gentlewoman of his Acquaintance . . . an obliging good-natured Woman, who was willing to shew her all the Diversions of the Town'.² The biographer's imagination getting to work on this statement produces the following:

She may have felt sorry to leave Cambridge; but if she did, her sorrow was soon dispersed on her arrival in London, for her hostess showed her the sights of the town and fascinated her with balls, masquerades, assemblies and theatres, the brilliance of which she had never before seen anything to equal.³

Harmless enough, perhaps; a legitimate expatiation on a colourless source. But as that source is itself suspect, and as the writer has no evidence to offer that the gentlewoman ever took her protégée to a single theatre or masquerade, a 'one may suppose' might have safeguarded the frontiers of truth. How easily, too, this habit of drawing upon the imagination may lead to fresh error may be seen from another statement by this same writer. Of the years which preceded the performance of Mrs. Centlivre's first play he remarks:

Ever since she had first come to London her thoughts had turned to the stage, and several times since she had attempted writing for the periodicals; but she soon found it no easy matter.⁴

Once again no authority is cited, and in fact nothing appears to be known of what Mrs. Centlivre may have written before 1700, when *The Perjur'd Husband*, her first play, was produced. What periodicals did Mrs. Centlivre (or Mrs. Carroll or Mrs. Fox) try to write for? What periodicals indeed were there to write for before 1700?

¹ *A Further Account Of the most Deplorable Condition of Mr. Edmund Curll, Bookseller*, 1716.

² F. *Neophilologus*, vol. xvi, p. 270.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 187.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

It may be thought that such statements as those, manifestly false or unsupported by any evidence, will quickly die and be forgotten. But error is often harder than truth. The writer who has just been quoted has himself perpetuated several errors from the account of Mrs. Centlivre which immediately preceded his own, and from which I can only suppose that he derived many of his facts. In mentioning *The Perjur'd Husband*, Lewis Melville had remarked that this was the play of Mrs. Centlivre's which first won the attention of the Town, and which

quickly brought her eminence in the literary world, and a publisher in the shape of the notorious Edmund Curll, of Paternoster Row.¹

Two years later this reappears in our second account with the inevitable accretions:

She had mounted the first step in the ladder of fame, and the noted Edmund Curll, pirate and publisher of seditious, immoral and scurrilous literature, always on the watch for promising copy, offered to print her play for her . . . she gladly accepted it. The sum paid her, no doubt, was beggarly . . . but still, she might esteem herself fortunate that he had asked to be allowed to print it. . . .²

Of this it is perhaps enough to say that *The Perjur'd Husband* was printed for Bennet Banbury, at the Blue Anchor in the New Exchange in the Strand, 1700. Curll has not, I believe, been traced as a publisher further back than 1706; in 1700 he was probably seventeen years old.

Again, perhaps owing to some difficulty in reading his own notes, the first of those two biographers introduces Joseph Centlivre into his narrative as

Chief Cook, or Warden of the Mouth, as he was quaintly termed, to Queen Anne.³

The second biographer follows with

a certain Mr. Joseph Centlivre, His Majesty's chief cook, or 'Warden of the Mouth', as the *Biographia Dramatica* humorously styles him.⁴

I do not know which edition of the *Biographia Dramatica* this writer has used, but in the edition of 1812-13 Centlivre is given his correct title of 'Yeoman of the Mouth'. If that is funny, it is not the *Biographia Dramatica's* joke.

Mrs. Centlivre, it will be said, has been unusually unfortunate in her biographers. It is true that she has been looked upon by the

¹ Lewis Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

² *Neophilologus*, vol. xvi, p. 271.

³ Lewis Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 272.

majority of those who have written her life as something of a joke, and no doubt Joseph Centlivre—'the man of pastry'—has been the innocent cause of most of their facetiousness. The gay adventures chronicled by Mottley have attracted the lover of scandal; and the difficulties encountered by Mrs. Centlivre in the early years of her authorship have prompted indignant ladies to use her life as a text for various sermons. But the same steady drift away from truth may be observed in the biographies of her contemporaries, and the same insidious amplification of the known or of the statement which has once appeared in print. The price of biographical truth appears, indeed, to be eternal vigilance, and eternal scepticism.

FIELDING'S IRONY: ITS METHODS AND EFFECTS

BY A. R. HUMPHREYS

Practical criticism, as applied to the novel, is still in the stage of experiment. The critic who is dealing with modern novelists of a highly developed sensibility, has no difficulty in proving the delicacy of their perceptions through the analysis of representative passages of their prose, by looking for degrees of subtlety and precision not very different from those expected in poetry. But criticism of most of the eighteenth and nineteenth century novelists still proceeds in terms of character, plot, and *mise-en-scène*, the established counters of critical discussion. It is still somewhat of an adventure to explore a novelist's qualities of mind through the local alertness of his writing.

Fielding's work, satirical and serious, gives, as Sir Leslie Stephen said, 'quite a peculiar impression of solidity and reality'. It does so for various reasons, mainly perhaps through the vigorous humour of its character-drawing and its sturdy forthrightness of style, but more generally and fundamentally because in its habits of thought and its social attitudes it is organically related to its century. His irony, far from being radically disturbing like that of Swift, is, in intention, corrective and orthodox; it undermines deviations from a healthy, sensible, social morality, it prunes society of perversions. Unlike the irony of Gibbon or Samuel Butler II, it does not unsettle traditional ethics and Christian orthodoxy—it is the irony of integration rather than disintegration.

This suggests, perhaps, a certain philosophical simplicity about Fielding's irony, and it is true that in comparison with many of the other great ironists he appears to launch his attacks in no very subtle manner. His strategy is frontal and conceived in daylight, the ambiguities between what is said and what is intended are clear on the surface, and do not attempt to spring surprises and betrayals. Swift, Gibbon, Butler, and Shaw imply, perhaps, a certain good-humoured contempt for the reader, and invite him to realize his own

stupidity by engaging his assent to propositions embodying his current prejudices, which then prove themselves to be preposterous. Fielding wishes merely to stand on a sensible, neighbourly, decent ethic, and (at least up to the time of *Amelia*) is unconcerned with any fundamental ills. His work has the characteristic virtues and drawbacks inherent in so organic a relationship to its century. Many types of experience are alien to it, many of its judgments little more than contemporary prejudices. On the other hand, the native assurance typical of its age, the sense of knowing just where one is and of grounding oneself on the sturdy principles of commonsense, aware of a vigorous social order and a reasonable, if limited, religious orthodoxy—these advantages are obvious on every page. Similar perspicacities and blind spots are widely shared by Fielding's generation. In particular, his irony reinforces the scorn for 'theory' and subtle ratiocination so typical of his empirical and practical age. Johnson, we remember, 'refuted' Berkeley by kicking his foot against a stone. It was the sort of proof Fielding himself liked, and any deviations from commonsense, whether prompted by sincere Christian zeal or by hypocrisy, are chastened by the most forthright, unsubtle, ironic devices. Parson Adams, after reproaching Joseph for the strength of his worldly attachment to Fanny, bursts into lamentations when his son is reported drowned; the philosopher of stoic virtue, Square, is found cowering in Molly Seagrim's bedroom.

Such orthodox irony, in support of so sensible a frame of mind, might be supposed to have lost interest after the passage of two centuries and the transition from a foursquare world to a disintegrating one. Yet it has not done so. Folly, one supposes, being perennial, can never be too much chastised, and commonsense, being infrequent, can never be too much reinforced. That being so, the technique of this irony which has for two centuries poured scorn on hypocrisy deserves some attention. At first one is puzzled to account for its effectiveness—or rather, for the fact that despite its crudity of outline it appears so mature. Fielding's practice with the drama—one remembers the slapdash success of *Pasquin*, *The Author's Farce*, and *Tom Thumb*—might give his satire decisiveness and energy, but the reasons why it has had so long a success involve an examination of his whole outlook and temper of mind.

One may assume, perhaps, that the severest exercise of the ironist's art is not to give the game away. In that respect, irony differs from sarcasm. The most outrageous things are to be said with a straight

face, with unbroken seriousness of demeanour: the poise is so consistently maintained that the reader is forced to realize the real inner meaning the more keenly by discovering it for himself. If intelligent, he succeeds; if stupid, he is taken in—the ironist's great triumph. But Fielding's art is not severe in this fashion. He is not writing for a very experienced audience, but for the eighteenth century's 'common reader', and he is not trying to score off that reader but to reinforce his native tendency towards good sense. *Jonathan Wild* could not suffer the fate of Butler's *Fair Haven*, which some reputable reviews took to be serious. Behind the vigorous sparring is the fighter who stands firmly on a sensible orthodoxy. In comparison with Swift, his irony is less intellectual, more muscular, less subtly integrated, more vehement, proceeding less from a profound inner organization of mind, more from the zeal of the practical reformer. Although the first of the following passages does not represent Swift at his best, tailing off as it does from irony into open sarcasm, it affords a close enough parallel to the second to stimulate one into drawing some comparisons.

- (a) I had the curiosity to enquire, in a particular manner, by what methods great numbers had procured to themselves high titles of honour and prodigious estates; . . . perjury, oppression, subornation, fraud, pandarism and the like infirmities were among the most excuseable arts they had to mention, and for these I gave, as it was reasonable, due allowance. But when some confessed they owed their greatness and wealth to vice, others to the betraying their country or their prince; some to poisoning, more to the perverting of justice in order to destroy the innocent; I hope I may be pardoned, if these discoveries inclined me a little to abate of that profound veneration which I am naturally apt to pay to persons of high rank, who ought to be treated with the utmost respect due to their sublime dignity by us, their inferiors.

(*Gulliver's Travels*: 'Laputa', ch. viii)

- (b) He was none of those half-bred fellows who are ashamed to see their friends when they have plundered and betrayed them; from which base and pitiful temper many monstrous cruelties have been transacted by men, who have sometimes carried their modesty so far as to the murder or utter ruin of those against whom their consciences have suggested to them that they have committed some small trespass, either by debauching a friend's wife or daughter, belying or betraying the friend himself, or some other such trifling instance. In our hero there was nothing not truly great; he could, without the least abashment, drink a bottle with the man who knew he had, the moment before, picked his pocket; and when he had stripped him of everything he had, never desired to do him any further mischief; for he carried

good nature to that wonderful and uncommon height, that he never did a single injury to man or woman, by which he himself did not expect to reap some advantage. (*Jonathan Wild*: ch. xi)

The qualities of feeling are somewhat different. Swift's 'grave verisimilitude' is different from the ready exaggeration, the macabre caricature, of Fielding. Swift tends relentlessly and unremittingly in one calculated direction; Fielding leaps from posture to posture. Swift has the inner and outer consistency of unruffled logic; Fielding the brilliant manifold brandishings of cut-and-parry debate—one never detects him in the same stance two sentences running. 'Half-bred' suggests supercilious scorn for those not brazened in rascality, whether in Wild's or Walpole's circles (where bad manners would arouse more disgust than bad morals); the forcefulness of 'plundered and betrayed' proceeds from another criterion—that of the outraged moralist; 'base and pitiful temper' shifts again—to Wild's diabolic scorn for the promptings of shame; 'monstrous cruelties' might be Wild hypocritically deprecating superfluous villany, or it might be the outraged moralist stating a fact; 'carried their modesty' is pure sarcasm; 'murder or utter ruin' is again the moralist stating a fact; 'consciences' is a sneer; 'small trespass . . . debauching a friend's wife or daughter . . . trifling instance' is angry sarcasm; 'nothing not truly great' is ironic (and, implies Fielding, a statement of fact, the pun in 'great' reminding us of the Court-Crime equation); 'without the least abashment' is ironic praise; 'never desired to do him any further mischief' is ironic praise by the standards of normal morality, but real praise in comparison with the vindictiveness of less 'magnanimous' criminals; 'good nature' is sarcasm; 'wonderful and uncommon height' is both sarcasm and, Fielding implies, an actual statement of fact; while 'expect to reap some advantage' is again ironic praise by the standards of normal morality, but real praise in comparison with Wild's meaner fellows. The interplay of different tones throughout is so alive that almost any phrase seems to shift its ground the more one looks at it.

When Swift groups 'perjury, oppression, subornation, fraud, pandarism and the like infirmities', the effect is very different. The even liteness of tone prevents the cool ingenious understatement from being too insistent. The abstract terms *conceal* the contrast between mere infirmities and the crimes mentioned. Perjury, oppression, and the rest are 'infirmities' because they are commonly treated as venial offences, but even more, Swift implies, because they are

essential frailties of human nature. One would be surprised by their absence, not by their presence. The common view holds them as mere trifles. Fielding, specifying debauchery of a friend's wife or daughter, by this very coarseness makes its discrepancy from a 'small trespass' broad and obvious. By implication, therefore, only those taking the diabolic point of view could condone it. Beyond the momentary sardonic belittlement, there is the strongest hint that normal morals would condemn such an act. Throughout *Jonathan Wild*, the praise or condoning of treachery is too blunt to persuade us that it is more than a pose: the reader automatically supplies the corrective of practical decency, as Fielding intended he should. The very tone and technique of the irony anchor him to orthodoxy, and because of this firmness, this central stability, he can allow himself to indulge apparently cynical or immoral points of view on the clear understanding, implied in his relationship to his reader, that it is all make-believe. The differences between Swift and Fielding in the implications of their irony define the different views they hold about human nature. Both envisage as a standard of comparison a sane moral order from which deviations can be judged; but by the perfect suavity of his tone Swift engages the reader to see it only as an abstract superhuman idea, practised only in the fictional world of Brobdingnag or the Houyhnhnms (the King of Brobdingnag's Olympian dismissal of humanity as 'the most pernicious race of little odious vermin that Nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth' is characteristic), and supplanted in practice by an orthodoxy based on observed behaviour and therefore essentially selfish and immoral. Fielding limits his denunciations to cases, admittedly numerous, of hypocrisy and ill-nature, which are always recognized as deviations from a healthy social conscience existing in the here and now, embodied not only in shadows like Heartfree and Mr. Allworthy, but in creatures of flesh and blood like Adams, Tom Jones, Sophia, and Amelia.

Fielding's irony, then, in comparison with Swift's, represents the social stability of its age, and instead of undermining reinforces orthodox morality. Consistently with this, it lacks philosophical and verbal complexity. This does not mean that it is a waste of time to attend to its small details, even though the reward is not so startling as it can be in the case of Swift, but simply that such 'ambiguities' as there are are soon exhausted. The reader must be awake to what Fielding is saying, since whatever his practice as a playwright he was

extremely careful as a novelist. But the close significance is that of perfect aptness to define and delimit the subject rather than, as with Swift, Gibbon, and Samuel Butler, to refer it through wide ranges of implication to a large context of moral scepticism. There is in Fielding's irony a superb felicitousness of detail—Miss Laetitia Snap, for instance, 'often confessed to her female confidantes, if she could ever have listened to the thought of living with any one man, Mr. Bagshot was he', where the whole effect depends on the intrusive 'one'—but in most cases of innuendo or double-entendre (Fielding's favourite types of ambiguity) the possible meanings are sharply limited and soon exhausted. The typical double-entendre or pun is marked by its flatly clear and separable components—as, for example, in *Jonathan Wild*, 'that final exaltation which . . . is the most proper and becoming end of all great men'—representing the matter-of-fact definition of central eighteenth-century prose with its concern for plain meanings.

Fielding's irony illuminates the whole temper of his mind. It has been a commonplace of criticism to dub him a realist, and his subject-matter justifies the label; but he shares the real strength of eighteenth-century realism in the imposition on his material of a firm and controlled pattern. The very stiltedness of style in which the more impassioned speeches are written is a mark of this (largely instinctive) formalization. The formal elaboration of speech, though to eighteenth-century taste it engaged the reader's emotions more strongly than it can do to-day, maintained a certain distance and decorum. Tom Jones' addresses to Sophia, for example, are rooted in the good sense which *The Spectator* had made such an integral part of the century's social behaviour. The most familiar difference between Richardson and Fielding is that the former, by every device in his power, invites the reader to indulge in strained and excessively stimulated states of feeling, while the latter, the master of the comic, preserves his own status, and that of the reader, as an observer. The rhythmical assurance, the grip over movement, the cogency and unobtrusive symmetry of the sentence, are indices of Fielding's real temper, though at present I can only refer to them in passing as the most potent means of implying the artist's self-control and self-possession.

In the sphere of irony, this quality of disciplined formalization shows itself in the elaborate preparation of simple deductions, the scrupulous proof of the obvious, the frankly prepared bathos. It also

has close affinities with the deliberate pattern which, for the purposes of comedy, is imposed on characters' behaviour. (This will be considered later—a type of formalization designed to sharpen outlines and to reduce the complex spontaneity of an individual's behaviour to the clearly apprehensible definiteness beloved of the cartoonist.) The most complete fund of Fielding's ironic mannerisms is to be found in *Jonathan Wild*, and most of the evidence will be taken from that book, though it differs from the other novels only in the degree to which it bases itself on irony.

The life of this enterprising character, at once thief-taker and receiver of stolen goods, exercised a particular fascination over the imaginations of the 1720s and 1730s. Digeon¹ lists a number of ballads, broadsides, and pamphlets which followed on his execution in 1725, and ten years later that collection of criminal biographies called *Lives of the Most Remarkable Criminals* begins its account by observing that there was no precedent for the alacrity with which romantic stories were fathered upon him in his life, and legendary accounts written of him after his death. Not only did these accounts gratify the normal human relish for the nefarious, but they saw in Wild's career something symbolic of the era of systematic corruption which has remained the standard charge against Walpole. Even the pot-boilers anticipated Fielding's 'thief-statesman' equation. 'We need make no apology for collecting these materials and offering them to the public,' says one of them,

for here they will meet with a system of politics unknown to Machiavel; they will see deeper stratagems and plots form'd by a fellow without Learning or Education than are to be met with in the conduct of the wisest Statesman.

It goes on precisely in Fielding's vein to explain how Wild 'show'd early signs of a forward genius', and by a cunning forgery 'laid the foundations of all his future greatness'. Wild had become an ironic popular legend, and Fielding adopted him with such a zest that Heartfree, the virtuous foil, was made to appear foolish and weak because he observed the dictates of normal decency. (The reason why Heartfree is an artistic disappointment is, it seems, that the irony will not work in inverse. If villainy is acclaimed as excellence and strength, virtue must be disparaged as stupidity and weakness; but though to undermine by sarcastic praise is easy, to eulogize by sarcastic disparagement is another matter.)

¹ *The Novels of Fielding*, 1925, pp. 97-9.

The ironic manner expresses itself, as so often in Fielding, in terms of the mock-heroic. The details of Wild's ancestry and birth, the deeds of his forefathers and the portents which accompanied his nativity are elaborated with a sufficiently broad parody of pedantic scholarship; stock epithets and heroic similes abound. Fielding is a master of these absurd inflations and deflations. Wild finds his 'chaste Laetitia' in the arms of Fireblood, and after a burst of inarticulate rage, says Fielding,

the following accents leapt over the hedge of his teeth, or rather, the ditch of his gums, whence those hedge-stakes had long since by a patten been displaced in battle with an amazon of Drury.*

* The beginning of this speech is lost.

One notes throughout the significant grandiloquence, the shifts of language towards the heroic and formally dignified, which are in keeping with two other qualities to be mentioned shortly—the careful show of logical method and the imposition of formal pattern on the characters' behaviour. It is akin also to the skilful periphrasis; Mr. Snap, we hear, 'would sometimes relax his mind from the violent fatigues of his employment' by playing cards—Mr. Snap was a Bow Street runner. The grandiloquence is persistent:

Men of great genius as easily discover one another as freemasons can. It was therefore no wonder that the Count soon conceived an inclination to an intimacy with our young hero, whose vast abilities could not be concealed from one of the Count's discernment.

A good many of Wild's conversations are in the same tone, heightened by a pretence at philosophy; he discusses with the Count the proper subjects of human ambition, and with Bagshot the rights of the Great Man; he discourses on honour to the quarrelling card-sharpers, soliloquizes superbly on statesmen and thieves, argues with Blueskin on political theory, calls on the prisoners of Newgate to submit to his authority—always with a formal elevation which implies Fielding's reference to the circles of court, where such grandiloquent theorizing of 'Great Men' would be more at home. Fielding does not directly *state* an intention of making such a reference through the medium of the style; yet one cannot help feeling it as a potent means of implying the equivalence of court and gaol.

To turn to another point: we are often struck by the success with which Fielding indulges in elaborate proof of the blindingly obvious, with the transparent suggestion that the world so flatly denies the dictates of sense and reason that even the self-evident must be supported by a Euclidean clarity of proof. Swift, too, makes stinging

implications about social behaviour by putting commonsense as though it were a startlingly original idea. The Houyhnhnms, for example, are unable to comprehend the practice of lying since it contravenes the most fundamental functions of communication. With more rough-and-tumble, less coolly perhaps and with more obvious sarcasm, Fielding demonstrates patiently that a justice of the peace should have some knowledge of the law (*Tom Jones*, VII, ix, *Amelia*, I, ii); that even two beaux rolled into one, with all the advantages of rank and fashion, will hardly benefit mankind as much as a single Shakespeare, Milton, or Newton (*Jonathan Wild*, I, x). In Swift, of course, the deliberation with which the should-be-obvious is expounded is the means by which radical hypocrisies are laid bare; the success of the process is a commonplace of Swiftian criticism. In Fielding the hypocrisies are nearer the surface; something, the reader feels, could be *done* about the social errors and stupidities which they reflect. The main point about such a mannerism, however, is not the surprise caused by the disparity between the solemn proof and the ironically obvious conclusion, but the way in which the formal gravity suggests a preference for firm outlines and controlled purposes so typical of Fielding's whole method as a novelist. It is a kind of pattern imposed deliberately yet spontaneously both on the characters' behaviour and on the circumstances which control their behaviour. Having told how Wild flung himself into the sea from a small boat, Fielding writes a whole chapter to account for his getting back into the boat again, on the ground that it was Nature's intention that he should be hanged and not drowned, and that her purposes are not to be thwarted. The transformation of a spontaneous and impromptu action into one performed to accord with a formal pattern is one of Fielding's most frequent ironic devices; at times it links arms with farce, but generally it is a source of strength. Blue-skin, brought into court, makes an attack on Wild and wounds him; the deduction is drawn with a formal gravity reinforced by a grip over rhythm:

This accident, however, was in the end attended with worse consequences: for, as very few people (those greatest of all men, absolute princes, excepted) attempt to cut the thread of human life, like the fatal sisters, merely out of wantonness and for their diversion, but rather by the so doing propose to themselves the acquisition of some future good or the avenging of some past evil; and as the former of these motives did not appear probable, it put inquisitive persons on examining into the latter.¹

¹ *Jonathan Wild*, IV, i.

That sort of 'realism', which is one of the staple methods of the novels, imposes on the unthinking or spontaneous actions and deductions of the characters a strong suggestion of deliberation and definite intention; the instinctive and intuitional become conscious and purposeful, and so contribute to the epic tone.

And this deliberation leads to the imposition of formality on the normal spontaneous behaviour of the characters themselves. The advantages which this ironical deliberation allows can be seen by considering the difference of tone between Fielding's and Dickens' treatment of the deception of honesty by villainy,—say in *David Copperfield* or *Oliver Twist*. The controlled tension in the one case keeps the emotions close to human reality and fact; the hysteria and exaggeration in the other make Uriah Heep and Fagin figures of nightmare. The farcical supernatural in *Jonathan Wild* serves just this purpose; Wild's life is lived in accordance with some formal intention of Nature which heralds his birth with portents and guides him unerringly through life to his destined end of the gallows. Fortune wards off the physical effects of Blueskin's attack; Nature makes sure Wild is not drowned; divine power superintends him:

He was enabled to provide himself with a place in the stage-coach; which, as God permitted it to perform the journey, brought him, at the appointed time, to an inn in the metropolis.¹

So, not perhaps with great subtlety, but with an admirable firmness, Fielding relates together the grandiose formality which is the mask and which raises *Jonathan Wild* to art, and the unsavoury reality on which it is moulded.

Art imposes pattern. The pattern in Fielding has the healthy discipline and strength, the poise and vigour of really central writing in the eighteenth century. It knows its distance from the object and spontaneously maintains it, even in the process of making direct comment. It is essential in Fielding's adoption of the heroic manner, not only in *Jonathan Wild* but in *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* too, that we should notice the manipulation of his characters and the interference, the deliberate gestures, he imposes on them. This deliberation, whether serious or comic, frequently coincides with a shift towards the 'heroic'.² It is a characteristic of the typically 'heroic' or mock-heroic. Cervantes and Scarron, among Fielding's

¹ *Jonathan Wild*, II, xiii.

² It is, incidentally, one reason for the crude psychology of the heroic play, in which the hero's dignity would be compromised by complex or undisciplined states of mind.

models, practise it frequently. Sidney uses it as a valid heightening of the romance:

It was in the time that the earth begins to put on her new apparel against the approach of her lover, and that the Sun running a most even course becoms an indifferent arbiter betweene the night and the day; when the hopelesse shepheard Strephon was come to the sandes which lie against the island of Cithera; where, viewing the place with a heavy kinde of delight, and sometimes casting his eyes to the Ileward, he called his friendly rivall, the pastor Claius unto him; and setting first downe in his darkened countenance a dolefull copie of what he would speake: 'O my Claius', said he, 'hether we are now come to pay the rent, for which we are so called unto by over-busie Remembrance, Remembrance, restlesse Remembrance, which claymes not only this dutie of us, but for it will have us forget our selves.'

The italicized words give a hint of the formal deliberation so typical of the 'heroic' idealized characterization; Fielding does exactly the same thing for his 'inverted heroic' satire:

*Our hero, finding himself in this condition [i.e. adrift in a small boat], began to ejaculate a round of blasphemies . . . He then accused the whole female sex . . . as the unhappy occasion of his present sufferings . . . At length, finding himself descending too low into the language of meanness and complaint, he stopped short, and soon after broke forth as follows; 'Damn it, a man can die but once, what signifies it? What signifies fear? I shall die whether I am afraid or no; who's afraid then, damn me?' At which words he looked extremely fierce, but recollecting that no-one was present to see him, he relaxed a little the terror of his countenance and . . . repeated the word 'Damn.'*²

By this careful definition of the various stages of Wild's feeling, Fielding gives a dignified order to the grumblings of a ruffian. Let us, he says on another occasion, 'keep our attention fixed on our hero, whom we shall observe taking large strides towards the summit of human glory'. Again there is the formalization, grand though grotesque.

This is largely the reason why the ironic manner is so successful. Fielding so obviously has his eye firmly on the characters, the outlines are so notably prominent, the behaviour deliberate, the control strongly exercised even when the outlines are farcical. His method deals particularly well with sharp formal oppositions of character or with symmetrical points of view in distinct antithesis. Molière, to whom he owed so much, was an adept in the same mannerism: the disputes between the *Maître à Danser* and the *Maître de Musique* before M. Jourdain are representative. Here is Fielding dealing with the rivalry of Thwackum and Square:

¹ *Arcadia*, the opening paragraph.

² *Jonathan Wild*, II, xi.

Square held human nature to be the perfection of all virtue, and that vice was a deviation from our nature, in the same way that deformity of body is. Thwackum, on the contrary, maintained that the human mind, since the fall, was nothing but a sink of iniquity, till purified and redeemed by grace . . . The favourite phrase of the former was the natural beauty of virtue; that of the latter, was the divine power of grace. The former measured all things by the unalterable rule of right, and the eternal fitness of things; the latter decided all matters by authority.¹

Though they would both make frequent use of the word Mercy, yet it was plain that in reality Square held it to be inconsistent with the rule of right; and Thwackum was for doing justice, and leaving mercy to heaven. The two gentlemen did indeed somewhat differ in opinion concerning the objects of this sublime virtue; by which Thwackum would probably have destroyed one half of mankind, and Square the other.²

The briskly formal-antithetical style is Fielding's chief weapon for reducing both propositions to absurdity; it suggests the inhumanity of the logic-chopping mind unilluminated by charity—and such a feeling underlies all his attacks on theoretical and hypocritical morality. He suggests a narrowness of mind by the very narrowness of the phrases. The most familiar instance is probably Thwackum's famous definition of religion as synonymous with the Church of England:

Honour . . . is not therefore manifold, because there are many absurd opinions about it; nor is religion manifold, because there are many sects and heresies in the world. When I mention religion, I mean the Christian religion; and not only the Christian religion, but the Protestant religion; and not only the Protestant religion, but the Church of England. And when I mention honour, I mean that mode of divine grace which is not only consistent with, but dependent upon, this religion; and is consistent with and dependent upon no other.³

By this 'pattern' of speech Fielding ironically presents his comment upon moral pedantry. The contrasts between precept and practice also become flatly clear and recognizable. Philosophers, he says, differ only in theory from other men:

They know very well how to subdue all appetites and passions, and to despise both pain and pleasure; and this knowledge affords much delightful contemplation, and is easily acquired; but the practice would be vexatious and troublesome; and therefore, the same wisdom which teaches them to know this, teaches them to avoid carrying it into execution.⁴

The same vital and alert outlines which he employs in revealing the antithetical hypocrisies of Thwackum and Square Fielding uses, too,

¹ *Tom Jones*, III, iii.

² *Tom Jones*, III, x.

³ *Tom Jones*, III, iii.

⁴ *Tom Jones*, V, v.

in the conduct of the incidents. He has already implied the unreality of Square's pretensions by the very primness with which he expounds them: all that is left to do is to show them shattered by real life—and behold, we find Square hiding behind the curtain in Molly Seagrim's bedroom. The angular caricaturing outlines and the unmasking turns of event are supplementary indices of the strongly precise way in which Fielding grasps his comic world.

Again and again we notice the effectiveness of the irony in reducing complex behaviour to a deliberate formalization—it is not too much to call this Fielding's favourite mode of psychological analysis. In some cases it is so prominent as to suggest that the Good and Bad Angels of the morality have been conscripted for the purposes of comedy. His practice as a dramatist impelled him in this direction, for plays, especially of his own farcical kind (and, strictly speaking, of any kind whatever) demand a clarification of behaviour; we are normally aware that things are being made much simpler for us; the pattern of action is far more sharply delimited than it ever is in real life; intentions and motives are more decisive. This, after all, is a fundamental condition of the reduction of life to literature, but in farce or comedy it is peculiarly pronounced. The *locus classicus* is perhaps the rumination of Launcelot Gobbo in *The Merchant of Venice*, II, ii, which starts:

The fiend is at mine elbow, and tempts me, saying to me, 'Gobbo, Launcelot Gobbo, good Launcelot . . . use your legs, take the start, run away'. My conscience says, 'No, take heed, honest Gobbo, honest Launcelot . . . do not run, scorn running with thy heels'.

The conflicts in the mind of Mrs. Honour when she wonders whether to be true to Sophia or to betray her flight to Squire Western, and in the mind of Black George when, having already stolen £500 which belonged to Tom Jones he was tempted to conceal a further sixteen guineas, are presented similarly as a comically precise battle, duly formalized.

His conscience . . . began to upbraid him with ingratitude to his benefactor. To this his avarice answered, That his conscience should have considered this before, when he deprived poor Jones of his £500. . . . In return to which, Conscience, like a good lawyer, attempted to distinguish . . . Avarice presently treated this with ridicule. . . . In short, poor Conscience had certainly been defeated in the argument, had not Fear stepped in to her assistance, and strenuously urged, that the real distinction between the two actions did not lie in the degree of honour, but that of safety. . . . By this friendly aid of Fear, Conscience obtained a complete

victory in the mind of Black George, and after making him a few compliments on his honesty, forced him to deliver the money to Jones.¹

The patterned deliberation shifts the tone tacitly towards the heroic—one reason, no doubt, why Fielding and most of his critics have saluted the 'epic' qualities of *Tom Jones*. The most jovially absurd example is perhaps the description of Tom's meal:

. . . three pounds at least of that flesh which formerly had contributed to the composition of an ox was now honoured with becoming part of the individual Mr. Jones.

The incident of the unfortunate sentinel frightened by the appearance of the swathed and bandaged Tom runs it close in this respect:

When the sentinel first saw our hero approach, his hair began gently to lift up his grenadier cap; and in the same instant his knees fell to blows with each other. Presently his whole body was seized with worse than an ague fit. He then fired his piece, and fell flat on his face.²

The effective rhythms assure us, even in the middle of farcical exaggeration, that there is nothing slipshod about this mode of comedy, that the genuine and powerful intellectual discipline behind it sets Fielding above his contemporary rivals and above all but two or three later novelists. It is this persistent impression of assurance and adequacy which, over and above matters of characterization and incident, which have been sufficiently praised, continues to evoke admiration through a succession of readings.

¹ *Tom Jones*, VI, xiii.

² *Tom Jones*, VII, xiv.

NEW ESSAYS BY DR. JOHNSON

By E. L. McADAM, Jr.

The time for a new and complete edition of the works of Dr. Johnson will not come before a more thorough study than Sir John Hawkins's or Boswell's has been made. The periodicals with which Johnson was known to have been associated must be searched with rigour for evidence of his hand, and 'lost' works delved for again. The manuscripts of Johnson's good friend Bishop Percy are now responsible for the addition of three new essays to the canon of Johnson's works.¹

Sometime, soon after 1765, perhaps, Percy stitched together a small collection of Johnson's writings—Irene (1754), London and The Vanity of Human Wishes from Dodsley's Collection (1765), The Vision of Theodore from The Grand Magazine of Magazines (1750), the Life of Cave from The Gentleman's Magazine (1754), and the Comus Prologue in his own transcript.² On a fly-leaf appears a list of 'Additions', written down between 1772 and 1775, judging from the contents. The first item on the list is 'The Weekly Correspondent in the first Year of the Public Ledger'. All the other items in the list are correct, as far as they have been identified, and there is no reason to doubt Percy's accuracy here.

The Weekly Correspondent is a series of three essays which appeared on December 2, 9, and 16, 1760. The third ends with the promise of another letter, but I have found no more.³ The second and best of the essays was reprinted in the British Magazine for the same month (1. 703-4), and was from thence, with twenty-four others, taken into Essays and Criticisms by Dr. Goldsmith, 1798, an anonymous collection without great authority, though a preface asserted that the new attri-

¹ I am indebted to Professor D. Nichol Smith for pointing out the note by Percy and suggesting that I should follow out the clue.

² This volume is now in the Bodleian, in the Percy collection.

³ I am indebted to Mr. Arthur Friedman of the University of Chicago for supplying me with a photostat of the first essay, from the copy in the British Museum. Copies of the second and third are in the Yale Library. Professor R. S. Crane was also able to find only three essays contributed by 'The Weekly Correspondent'. He did not, however, attribute any of them to Johnson. *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, 1927, p. 137.

butions were made by Thomas Wright, who had no demonstrable connexion with the *British Magazine*.¹ The first and third essays have not been reprinted, as far as I know, but the other has regularly appeared in editions of Goldsmith's works since 1798. It is in Johnson's best style, and may take its place among the *Ramblers* and *Idlers* without fear of comparison. To put off the reader no longer, the three essays are presented forthwith.

To the Author of the PUBLIC LEDGER
The WEEKLY CORRESPONDENT
NUMBER I.

SIR,

HAVING resolved to contribute some Essays to your compilation, I have been some time in doubt by what title I shall distinguish myself from my associates. It is common for deliberation to end without much effect; I have for the present suspended my ambition of a pompous name, and desire to be mentioned only as the *Weekly Correspondent*.

Readers have been accustomed to expect some account of a new Author. And the Essayists seem to think that they are invested with some peculiar right to talk of themselves, inherited perhaps from their ancestor Montaigne.

But since Experience always teaches us, that Expectation produces Disappointment, I shall not attempt to impress upon you, or your readers, any such particular character of myself, as may enable you to anticipate my performances. I shall not inform you whether I was born on the North or the South side of Trent; whether my life has been idle or active, whether my youth was passed in assemblies of gaiety or clubs of politics, among critics in the theatre or among sportsmen on the course; whether I am now struggling in the bustle of life, or only a spectator of the shifting scene.

Those hours of life, says Horace,² for which we do not hope, will be doubly welcome. What is true of life itself, is sure not less true of all its gratifications. That which pleases much, must be more than was expected. I shall therefore leave it uncertain how my observation has been employed, what I have collected in my book of common-places, and what will be the most frequent subjects of my thoughts. I hope that the attention which leisure and curiosity may bestow upon me, will not be wholly lost; and cannot but think it reasonable, that where nothing is promised, a little should content.

If the reader should think himself defrauded of his right, and urge his claim to ampler information; let him remember, that confidence ought to be reciprocal, and that he knows already more of me, than I shall ever know of him. There is no reason why the series of my life and conversation should be entrusted to those who have given no promise of secrecy, and

¹ See Crane, *op. cit.*, xii-xvi.

² *Epistles*, 1. 4.

of whom I cannot guess whether they are gentle or severe, captious or candid, benevolent or malicious. A book is seldom taken up with very kind intentions: few wish to be pleased, and much fewer wish to be taught. The general design of readers is to exert the acuteness of remark, or to display the superiority of contempt. He that undertakes to furnish literary amusements, must expect no tenderness but from the ignorant and the young, who are not too proud to own a master, and having never yet aspired to the reputation of thinking for themselves, have neither been made vain by praise, nor sullen by censure.

A writer therefore does not engage his readers on equal terms: he presents himself to their notice, but they may neglect him without hazard. The most laboured performance of wit and learning is as easily thrown into the fire, as a taylor's bill. The demonstrator may try to convince the reason, and the man of fancy to move the passions; but when each has done all that he can, no man is obliged to have his passions moved, or his reason convinced: all may refuse to read; or all may read without attention, and refuse to understand.

From such injurious treatment the poor author has no appeal, but to posterity; but posterity is too distant to help him, and however loudly he may call upon it, he is seldom in any real haste to be heard. It is much safer to lie concealed in nameless obscurity; and, instead of imploring posterity, to have this comfort in his disappointments, that none know them but himself.

NUMBER II.

*Illam omnis tectis agrisque effusa juvenus
Turbaque miratur matrum, & prospectat euntem
Attonitis inhians animis, ut regius ostro
Velet honos leves humeros ut fibula crinem
Auro internectat—*

Virg. [A. 7. 812-6.]

That a time of war is a time of parsimony, is a maxim which Patriots and Senators have had often in their mouths, and which I do not remember ever to have been denied.

I know not whether by the acute enquiries of the present age, this opinion has been discovered to be groundless, and is therefore thrown aside among obsolete follies; or whether it has happened on this, as on other occasions, that conviction is on one side, and practice on the other; but so it is, that the War, whatever it has taken from our Wealth, has added nothing to our Frugality. Every place of splendid Pleasure is filled with assemblies, every Sale of expensive Superfluities is crowded with buyers; and War has no other effect, than that of enabling us to shew that we can be at once Military and Luxurious, and pay Soldiers and Fiddlers at the same time.

Among other changes which Time has effected, a new species of Profusion has been produced. We are now, with an emulation never known

before, out-bidding one another for a Sight of the Coronation; the annual rent of Palaces is offered for a single Room for a single Day.

I am far from desiring to repress Curiosity, to which we owe so great a part of our intellectual pleasures, nor am I hardy enough to oppose the general practice of mankind, so much as to think all pomp and magnificence useless or ridiculous. But all passions have their limits, which they cannot exceed without putting our happiness in danger; and although a fine show be a fine thing; yet, like other fine things, it may be purchased too dear. All pleasures are valuable in proportion to their greatness and duration: that the pleasure of a show is not of any long continuance, all know, who are now striving for places; for if a show was long, it would not be rare. This is not the worst, the pleasure while it lasts will be less than is expected. No human performance can rise up to human ideas. Grandeur is less grand, and finery less fine, than it is painted by the fancy. And such is the difference between hope and possession, that, to a great part of the spectators, the show will cease as soon as it appears.

Let me yet not deceive my readers to their disadvantage, or represent the little pleasures of life as less than they are. Those who come to see, come likewise to be seen, and will, for many hours before the procession, enjoy the eyes of innumerable gazers. Nor will this be the last or the longest gratification; those who have seen the coronation, will have whole years of triumph over those who saw it not. They will have an opportunity of amusing their humble friends and rustic acquaintances with narratives, often heard with envy, and often with wonder; and when they hear the youth of the next generation boasting the splendor of any future procession, they will talk with contemptuous superiority of the coronation of George the Third.

NUMBER III.

Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis.

Hor. [*Ep. I. I. 100.*]

To the Author, &c.

Sir,

I Am a great lover of Building and Demolishing; and not having a fortune equal to my desires, have for some time contrived to gratify my humour at the expence of others. Many edifices have risen, and many have fallen by my advice, when I had no real design but to promote my own amusement.

When a young man inherits an estate, which I think him not qualified to spend with decency, it is my custom to creep into his favour, and lay before him a plan of a new house; the architects immediately hear that he is a lover of Building, flatter his taste, and honour his magnificence; down goes the Gothic seat of his ancestors, and a new house, with a noble *salon*, is raised upon its ruins; the owner puts his estate into the hands of his steward, and retires to Boulogne, till his creditors are paid.

This had so often happened, that the name of *Tom Stucco* became formidable, and ruin was predicted to all that received me at their tables.

I found all sport with private purses at an end, and had recourse to bodies politic: I was the first projector of the Mansion-house, and the original proposer of the Bridge at Black Friars. Having been thus successful in new edifices, I was now to consider what buildings could be spared, and immediately cast my eyes upon the Gates of the City. It was natural to suppose, that the Londoners would not easily throw down the ancient boundaries of their jurisdiction, and deface the venerable monuments of their ancestors raised with strength and solidity which disdained ornament, and which well represented the rough grandeur of men that had more Magnanimity than Elegance.

To overpower these prejudices, I framed a long memorial of Evils that were never felt, and of Advantages that never will be found. I told how at every Gate, meeting carriages were overturned in the conflict, and the King's good subjects crushed under them; and filled the town with accounts of lives lost and limbs broken, though I believe that twenty pounds a year would more than compensate all the delays and mischiefs suffered at all the Gates. I clamoured again and again, that the life of London was Trade; and that Trade could never flourish where it was obstructed; that they should open their entrances to all comers, and plenty would pour in at every corner.

All this may form a sufficient burthen for credulity, yet I ventured still further: I lamented that the Cathedral was placed where it could not be seen and remarked, that the downfall of Ludgate would open a full view of it to Fleet-street. The citizens, having no great skill in optics, did not know that they could not see along a curve, but fell furiously upon Ludgate: I said nothing, but let them work on, in hope of a prospect, which, with all their toil, they have not obtained.

Having thus told you what I have already done; I shall proceed, in my next letter, to tell you what I design.

I am, &c.

TOM STUCCO.

The plan for building Mansion House was reported in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for April 1738, p. 218, a month after Johnson's first contribution to the magazine, and about the time Cave engaged him as a regular contributor. The construction began in the following year and was finished in 1753, seven years before the publication of this essay. In 1760 civic improvements were made on all sides. An Act of Parliament was passed following a petition of the lord mayor, aldermen, and commons of London granting leave to widen several old streets and open several new ones,¹ and on 30 July "The materials of the 3 following city gates were sold before the committee of city lands to Mr. *Blagden*, a carpenter in *Coleman-street*, viz. *Aldgate* for 177*l.* 10*s.*, *Cripplegate* for 91*l.*, and *Ludgate* for 148*l.* The purchaser

¹ *G. M.* 1760, pp. 45, 277, 294.

was to begin to pull down *Ludgate* on *August 4*, and the two others on *September 1*, and is to clear away all the rubbish, &c. in two months from those days.¹

According to Wheatley, *Ludgate* was taken down 'at the solicitation of the inhabitants of Farringdon Within and Farringdon Without'.² In September a correspondent signing himself 'B.' wrote to *The Gentleman's Magazine* that Bishopsgate was the nearest gate to the centre of the city 'and, in a very public place, a great incumbrance'.³ On 10 December, therefore, Bishopsgate was sold, 'to be pulled down with all convenient speed'.⁴ This was no doubt the immediate cause of Johnson's essay. The temper of the times was, however, against him: in the same month *The Gentleman's Magazine* printed two essays asking for more extensive improvements (pp. 501, 609), and Moorgate and Aldersgate were sold on 22 April following.⁵

Johnson had already shown considerable interest in the building of Blackfriars Bridge. Exactly a year previously he had contributed three letters to *The Daily Gazette* (1, 8, 15 Dec.) favouring the plan of his friend John Gwynn and attacking the designs of the rival competitors.⁶ Gwynn had not succeeded, and the bridge was begun in June, 1760. 'A question seriously discussed at the time was "whether a bridge from Blackfriars to Southwark would be a public benefit".'⁷

It is just possible that Johnson had John Gwynn in mind while writing as Tom Stucco. Gwynn was apparently not educated as an architect, for he is described in *Observations on Bridge Building*, 1760, p. 22, as 'till of late of another profession'.⁸ In 1769 he exhibited 'A design for the alteration of an old room in Shropshire', which might perhaps indicate a yearning to pull down old houses. In his capacity of surveyor at Oxford he demolished the east gate, the north gate called the Bocardo, and the old Magdalen Bridge. And it will be remembered that in 1766 Johnson wrote the dedication to the king of Gwynn's *London and Westminster Improved*.

At this point we must return to the essay on the approaching coronation. This is of particular interest in view of the fact that Johnson 'lent his friendly assistance to correct and improve'⁹ Gwynn's pamphlet *Thoughts on the Coronation of his present Majesty, King George the Third*, 1761. The first three paragraphs may be quoted for comparison:

¹ *G. M.*, 1760, p. 390.

² *G. M.*, 1760, p. 407.

³ *G. M.*, 1761, p. 187.

⁷ Wheatley, *op. cit.*, 1. 197.

³ *London Past and Present*, 2. 444.

⁴ *G. M.*, p. 591.

⁶ See *Life*, 1. 351-52; *Works*, 1825, v. 303-10.

⁸ Quoted in *D. N. B.*

⁹ *Life*, 1. 361.

All pomp is instituted for the sake of the publick. A show without spectators can no longer be a show. Magnificence in obscurity is equally vain with a sundial in the grave.

As the wisdom of our ancestors has appointed a very splendid and ceremonious inauguration of our kings, their intention was, that they should receive their crown with such awful rites, as might for ever impress upon them a due sense of the duties which they were to take, when the happiness of nations is put into their hands; and that the people, as many as can possibly be witnesses to any single act, should openly acknowledge their sovereign by universal homage.

By the late method of conducting the coronation, all these purposes have been defeated. Our kings, with their train, have crept to the temple through obscure passages; and the crown has been worn out of sight of the people. Of the multitudes, whom loyalty or curiosity brought together, the greater part has returned without a single glimpse of their prince's grandeur, and the day that opened with festivity ended in discontent.¹

One of Gwynn's proposals was 'the demolition of the Gate house, a building so offensive, that, without any occasional reason, it ought to be pulled down, for it disgraces the present magnificence of the capital, and is a continual nuisance to neighbours and passengers'.² Toward the end, Johnson or Gwynn comments on 'the excessive prices, at which windows and tops of houses are now let'.³ According to the *Annual Register* for 1761, p. 218, 'The front seats in the galleries of the abbey, were let at ten guineas each, and those in commodious houses along the procession, at no less prices. The prices in the ordinary houses were from five guineas to one guinea, so that one little house in Coronation-row, after the scaffolding was paid for, cleared 700*l.* and some large houses upwards of 1000*l.*'

Johnson himself saw the coronation, though we do not know whether he followed his own advice about how much to pay for a seat. Ten days before the ceremony he wrote to Percy, 'The kindness of your invitation would tempt me to leave pomp and tumult behind, and hasten to your retreat; however, as I cannot perhaps see another coronation so conveniently as this, and I may see many young Percies, I beg your pardon for staying till this great ceremony is over. . . .'⁴

It is probably of little use to inquire why Johnson dropped *The Weekly Correspondent* after the third number. He had finished *The Idler* in April and was engaged in no very pressing work except perhaps the edition of Ascham published in 1761. It may be, however, that he resumed more active preparation of his Shakespeare at this

¹ *Works*, 1825, v. 451-52.

² P. 458.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 455-56.

⁴ *Letters*, No. 139, Sept. 12, 1761.

time, though it did not appear for four more years. This was at any rate Johnson's last attempt at a series of essays.

I have one more suggestion to fill in this rather lean year in Johnson's career. I believe that he corrected and revised, if he did not write, the preliminary address to the public for the *Public Ledger*. Three years earlier Johnson had written a similar address for *The London Chronicle* for his friend Dodsley. Griffith Jones (1722-86), editor of the *Public Ledger*, was according to Nichols, who knew him well, 'many years editor of the London Chronicle [and] the Daily Advertiser',¹ but I judge at a later period. But Jones had worked under Johnson on *The Literary Magazine* (1756-58), and was later his neighbour in Bolt Court. He is one of those to whom the authorship of *Goody Two-Shoes* and other works of the Newbury shop have been attributed. A single letter from Johnson to him exists, dated only 'Oct. 9', and concerned merely with the insertion of an advertisement in *The Daily Advertiser*.² At any rate, it is clear that Johnson knew Jones as early as January, and he also knew Newbury, the publisher of the paper, in which two of the *Idlers* were reprinted in early numbers. I should like to call particular attention to the first two, the fifth, and the last paragraphs of the preliminary address, as representative of Johnson's style.

To the PUBLIC.

The Want which every Man feels of another's Help is the original Cause of Coalition and Society; and the Institutions of Society are less imperfect, in Proportion as all Wants are more easily supplied; and they are supplied more easily, as the general Stock of the Community is better known, and each Man is more extensively informed of the Occasions, Abilities, and Possessions of the rest.

The speedy Circulation of Intelligence, and the mutual Communication of Proposals and Designs, of Desires to purchase, and of Willingness to sell, is one of the great Arts by which Commerce is actuated and maintained. By this necessity of Publication the News-papers are filled with Advertisements, and the Walls, in Places of Concourse, covered with Proposals: Bills of Direction are given at every Shop, and Notices of Sales and Auctions scattered before Houses or forced into the Hands of Passengers.

All these Practices are convenient and beneficial; yet all these have proved insufficient, and many Persons are daily at a Loss to find out what they want. A general Search, however advantageous, must be attended with such Difficulty, and so much Time and Expence, as would render it

¹ *Lit. Anec.*, iii. 465, from which all details here given about Jones are taken. The account in *D. N. B.* adds little.

² *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, 2. 454.

almost impossible for any one to accomplish; unless the great Variety of Business, Wants, Schemes, Proposals, Orders, Meetings, Transactions, Invitations, and Amusements, continually set forth in the Public Papers and Bills, are daily brought into one collected Point of View.

Attempts have been made for this Purpose, or perhaps rather meant by our Public Register Offices; but upon so confined a Plan, however good the Design, that the Enquirers could, at best, only learn a few registered Particulars, merely relative to the narrow Compass of the Bills of Mortality, and scarcely one in five hundred ever got the Information he required. Nor could it be otherwise; for as all Intelligence at these Offices depended on their Customers, and was registered at their Expence, the Design naturally became abortive for want of Support from the Proprietors, who, being able to give but little Information of their own, could afford little Aid to those who stood in need of their Assistance.

From this universal Emulation of forcing Advertisements into Notice through different Papers, and by various other Methods, it must necessarily follow, that Intelligence, however copious, is confused; that as the Number of Particulars is greater, that which is sought will be less easily found. No single Hand receives all Bills; no single Eye, peruses all News Papers. Not only Patience is wearied, but Time is lost, and Opportunity slips away. The Advertisement of To-day is forgotten To-morrow, and fear of the Expence will not allow it to be often repeated. The Offices may be searched for more permanent Registers; but they have failed so often that they are now less frequently visited.

Experience, therefore, has long shewn, that there is yet wanting a Paper, which may serve as an *Index* to all other Papers and Publications, and which will supply the Deficiencies of each from all the rest, yet not render any of them useless; as, instead of giving the full Account required, it will only shew the Paper or Place in which the Advertisement or Public Notice may be found. Of this *Index* the next Page exhibits a Specimen, and a single Specimen will demonstrate its Utility.

By this Index, to our *Wants and Desires*, will be raised such a Fund of Intelligence and useful Knowledge, relating to the Trade, Commerce, Proposals, Schemes and Connexions of Mankind, as may not improperly be called a *Bank of Enquiry*, which bringing all Parties together, as it were in a Center, will readily help them to whatever they require, and every Man to see at one View as he sits at Home in his Chair, the various Sollicitudes of the rest, and know where to avail himself of the Wants of others, or to supply those of his own.

To leave nothing unattempted which may promote our Scheme of general Information, an Office is erected in St. Paul's Church-Yard, next Door to the Great Toy-Shop, in which is repositied the Public Ledger, where all Papers of Intelligence, published within the Kingdom, with Minutes of all Advertisements, Bills, Proposals, Schemes, Designs, Projects and Notices, will be registered, in Alphabetical Order according to their Subjects, and their Dates, in such a Manner that every Enquirer, on paying *Three-pence* for searching the Office, may find whatever he can require, or be convinced that he requires what is no where to be found.

And to render the Purpose of Advertising more complete and effectual than it has hitherto been, it is proposed that every Advertisement inserted in the Public Ledger shall be also registered in the Office with as many or as few Particulars as the Advertiser shall think proper; and that the Expence of the Whole for every Advertisement of a moderate Length, shall not exceed Three Shillings. So that by Advertising in this Paper, he that desires to conceal any part of his Proposal from the Public Eye, may insert a short Hint in the Paper, and Register [a] ¹ longer and more explicit Account in the Office and express his Thoughts obscurely to those whom he does not wish to understand them, and more clearly and at large to others whose Curiosity, or Interest shall lead them to inspect the PUBLIC REGISTER; the easy Access to which, being so much more agreeable to the Enquirer than a private Application, will be another Advantage in Advertising peculiar to this Paper.

But as Registering alone has been found very ineffectual, it is proposed that nothing shall be registered in the Books of the Office, till it has been first Advertised in the Ledger. By the former of which it will be kept on Record (unless desired to be withdrawn) and by the Latter made known to the Public as often as is necessary. And for the Convenience of those who may want to consult the Office from distant Places, a sufficient Number of Clerks will give Attendance from Eight o'Clock in the Morning till Six in the Evening; who besides admitting every Person to consult the Register at *Three-pence* as abovementioned, will answer all Letters with the utmost Punctuality, on the receipt of *One Shilling* for each; so that those who live in the most distant Parts of the Kingdom, may have Access to the Register, almost as easily as those who reside in London.

Thus much, however extensive, is only one Part of our Plan; yet the *grand* One, it must be confessed, and calculated for the real Use of, perhaps, Nine Parts in Ten of the Nation; for the Busy, and Active, the Curious, and Circumspect, will all in their Turn find some useful Hint or Reference to assist their various Occasions. But that the Man of Leisure and Retirement, who reads for Pleasure and Amusement, may also find his Account in inspecting the Public Ledger, one Part of it will be set aside for Public Occurrences, both Foreign and Domestic, in which, if we do not excel all other Daily Papers, we shall take care not to fall short of any.

We are unwilling to raise Expectations which we may, perhaps, find ourselves unable to satisfy; and, therefore, have made no mention of Criticism or Literature, which yet we do not professedly exclude, nor shall we reject any Political Essays, that are apparently calculated for the Public Good. In a Nation like ours, equally studious of Knowledge, and of Gain, he that neglects the Sciences will be despised, even by many of those whom he may assist in Commerce; and he that appears indifferent about National Concerns will never have a clear Title to the Favour and Esteem of the Public, which is what we are most solicitous to deserve.²

THE PROPRIETORS.

¹ Omission supplied on 17 January.

² 12 January, 1760; repeated daily, 14-19 January.

The detailed and factual nature of this essay suggests that Johnson was given a prospectus to revise, and that he added sentences and paragraphs, especially when an opportunity for generalization arose, as his fancy struck him. One point may be noted: it is curiously ironic that the passing and rather humble notice of criticism and literature in the last paragraph should be made in a paper which was within two weeks to begin publication of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*. No paper of the century could boast a greater honour. The need for such a publication as *The Public Ledger* was testified by the response, and its long subsequent history would have gratified all those who had any part in its inception.

In conclusion then, we have a new though brief periodical publication by Johnson, demonstrated to be his by both external and internal evidence of the strongest sort, a work which can take its place with his best. Finally, there is added another composition to the large group to which he contributed a few paragraphs. Here, it is true, the attribution is based upon internal evidence, but that evidence is supported by external circumstances to an unusual degree.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

INTERFUSED SOURCES IN JOSEPH HALL'S SATIRES

Though editors and critics of Joseph Hall's satires have often noted his extensive use of borrowed material, they have not adequately realized how frequently different passages of his reading have become fused in his memory and emerge mutually enriched as he writes. Failure to recognize this fact has left editors in difficulties with some of the numerous obscure passages in *Virgidemiae*,¹ and has led critics to be unduly severe in assessing Hall's claim to originality. It is only rarely that his borrowings savour of the mechanical. For the most part they are assimilations rather than imitations; and as a rule one finds that a remembered passage of Juvenal, for instance, has brought with it into *Virgidemiae* touches from Virgil, Chaucer and probably other authors as well.² The imaginative process at work seems to be precisely the same as that investigated by Professor Lowes in his book on Coleridge, though I have not been able—lacking any notebooks kept by Hall—to trace out the confluent rivulets of memory in so much detail. Hall's imagination, moreover, seems to have dealt more with ideas or images expressive of ideas than with vivid details of sense-impressions. I find nothing in his poetry quite comparable to the water-snake passage in *The Ancient Mariner* which Lowes has shown to be made up of endless diverse memories of descriptive details.

But a similar fusing of reminiscences does occur, although in a simpler manner, as when, laughing at the idea that deep learning is voluble and ostentatious, Hall writes:

And can deepe skill lye smothering within
Whiles neither smoke nor flame discerned bin?

¹ I hope that the almost completed edition of Hall's poems which I am preparing will clear up most of these difficulties; but I cannot hope to publish it until after the war.

² *Virgidemiae*, III, i, 1 sqq. Warton pointed to *Juvenal*, VI, i, 1 sqq. as the source; but compare also Virgil, *Georg.* I, 125 sqq. and Chaucer, *The Former Age* and *Boethius*, II, metre v (prose version). Other possible ingredients are Seneca *Epist.*, XC, 36, Ovid, *Amor.*, III, viii, 35 sqq., *Met.* I, i, 89 sqq., Spenser, *Shep. Cal.* May.

Shall it not be the wild-fig in a wall
 Or fired Brimstone in a Minerall?
 Doe thou disdaine, O ouer-learned age,
 The tongue-ty'd silence of that *Samian* sage;
 Forth ye fine wits, and rush into the presse,
 And for the cloyed world your workes addresse.¹

The plan of the satire in which this occurs is suggested by a satire of J. C. Scaliger,² and this particular passage is possibly influenced by Scaliger's epigram *In Bibinum*.³ Similarities of imagery stirred an echo from Persius who emerges in the third line of the quotation. This line has bothered some readers, and Wynter even suggested that there is a misprint and that we should read 'wild-fire', that is, 'Greek fire', which would bring the image into line with the flame and the fired Brimstone. But Persius justifies our keeping to the reading of the early editions which makes perfectly good sense, since he has:

Quo didicisse, nisi hoc fermentum et quae semel intus
 innata est rupto iecore exierit caprificus? ⁴

Persius makes the wild fig tree of ambition burst out of the breast, and Hall could, no doubt, have expanded the metaphor to include the 'wall' on his own account; but it happens that Juvenal, whose satires Hall had closely studied, writing of the love of fame which is stronger than the love of virtue, and commenting on the desire to have eulogies on one's grave-stone, remarks that the tomb itself is only of *stones*

ad quae
 discutienda valent sterilis mala robora ficus.⁵

A link of subject matter and possibly of imagery brought up the fig tree from Persius, and Persius' metaphor when it came was sharpened into concreteness by the preciser image from Juvenal which was linked to it both by similarity of subject and by the fig tree itself.

This particular example, left unsupported, may seem somewhat far-fetched, but in the following passage we have, I think, clear evidence that Hall's bookish imagination did work in this fashion. It occurs in a satire in which he is mocking the notion that a big book

¹ *Virgidenia*, VI, i, 145-52.

² I am indebted to Professor E. Bensly for pointing this source out to me.

³ See Scaliger, *Poemata Omnia*, 1600, Pt. I, p. 417.

⁴ Persius, I, 24-5.

⁵ Juvenal, X, 144-5.

must necessarily be a great book, or that a tiny book must be 'little and good', and he pursues the latter topic thus:

But well fare *Strabo*, which as stories tell,
 Contriu'd all *Troy* within one Walnut shell.
 His curious Ghost now lately hither came,
 Arriuing neere the mouth of luckie Tame.
 I saw a *Pismire* strugling with the lode,
 Dragging all *Troy* home towards her abode.
 Now dare we hither, if he durst appeare,
 The subtile *Stithy-man* that liu'd while eare:
 Such one was once, or once I was mistaught,
 A Smith at *Vulcan* his owne forge vp brought,
 That made an Iron-chariot so light,
 The coach-horse was a Flea in trappings dight.
 The tame-lesse steed could well his wagon wield,
 Through downes and dales of the vneven field.
 Striue they, laugh we: mean while the Black-smiths toy
 Passes new *Strabo* and new *Straboes Troy*.¹

The starting point of these lines is, as Maitland noted, a passage in the *Natural History* of Pliny:

Oculorum acies vel maxima fidem excedentia invenit exempla. In nuce inclusam Iliadem Homeri carmen in membrana scriptum tradit Cicero . . . Huic et nomen N. Varro reddit, Strabonem vocatum; . . . Callicrates ex ebore formicas et alia tam parva fecit animalia ut partes eorum a ceteris cerni non possent. Myrmecides quidam in eodem genere inclauit quadriga ex eadem materia quam musca integeret alis fabricata et nave quam apicula pinnis absconderet.²

In Hall's memory, however, this had fused with a passage from Stowe's *Annals* which shouldered Pliny's ant into another place and gave it other duties, introduced the Flea, changed Myrmecides into a blacksmith and transmuted his toy into iron, and possibly provided the word 'contrived':

A strange peece of worke, and almost incredible, was brought to passe by an Englishman born within the cittie of London, and a Clarke of the Chancerie named *Peter Bales*, who by his industrie and practice of his pen contriued and writ within the compasse of a penie, in Latine, the

¹ *Virgidemiae*, II, i, 37-52. I quote from the 1598 edition of the 'Toothless Satires'. The editions of 1597 and 1602 and all modern editions read 'black storie' instead of 'Black-smiths toy'. 1602 was printed from 1597, perhaps because the 1598 was unprocurable as a result of the Bishop of London's order in 1599 (see Arber, III, 677) to burn various controversial books, Hall's among them, although in his case the order was rescinded. At any rate, only two copies of 1598 appear to survive, the one I quote from being in the library at Lambeth Palace. All modern editions ignore it, although here and elsewhere it justifies its claim to be 'Corrected and amended'.

² Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, VII, 21.

Lordes prayer, the Creede, the ten Commaundments, a prayer to God, a prair for ye Queene, his Posie, his name, the day of the moneth, the yeere of our Lorde, and the raigne of the Queene: And at Hampton Court he presented the same to the Queenes Maiestie in the heade of a Ring of golde, couered with a Chrystall, and presented therewith an excellent Spectacle by him deuised for the easier reading thereof, wherewith her Maiestie reade all that was written therein, and did weare the same vpon hir finger.

Also about the same time *Marke Scaliot* blacke Smith, borne in London, for triall of workmanship, made one hanging locke of iron, steele, and brasse, a pipe key filed three square, with a pot vpon the shaft, and the bowe with two esses, al cleane wrought, which weied but one grain of gold or wheate corne: he made also a chaine of golde of 43. links, to the which chaine the locke and key being fastened and put about a fleas neck, shee drew the same, all which locke, key, chaine and flea, weied but one graine and a halfe, as is yet to be seen vpon Corne-hill by Leadenhall, at the sayde *Marks* house.¹

It should be noted that the 'new Strabo' is not Peter Bales. His place is usurped by Peele's *Tale of Troy* which, after its first issue in 1589, was printed as a tiny thumb-book. No copy earlier than 1604 survives of this 'New *Straboes Troy*', but a reference by John Weeuer² makes it clear that one existed in 1599, and this passage shows that it existed before 1597. Stowe's naïve pride that his two heroes should have been born in London perhaps accounts for Hall's otherwise rather aimless adjective, 'the mouth of *luckie Tame*'.

But the main point is that by this conflation of sources Hall is able to draw a neat parallel between ancient and modern artificers of futilities, and the passage gained added point for his contemporary readers since it held up two modern practitioners of littleness for comparison and scorn.

Two stanzas from the prefatory poem, *His Defiance to Enuie*, provide an equally striking example of the intimate intermingling of sources. Talking of the kinds of poetry he might have written instead of satire, Hall writes:

Or list us make two striuing shepheards sing,
With costly wagers for the victory,
Vnder Menalcas iudge: whiles one doth bring
A caruen Bole well-wrought of Beechen tree:
Praising it by the story, or the frame,
Or want of vse, or skilfull makers name.

¹ Stowe, *Annales*, 1592, sig. 4G6^v. The passage does not seem to appear in all the later editions.

² See Weeuer's *Epigrammes*, 1599, ed. R. B. McKerrow, p. 97 and editor's note.

Another layeth a well-marked Lambe,
 Or spotted Kid, or some more forward Steere;
 And from the payle doth praise their fertile dam:
 So do they strue in doubt, in hope, in feare,
 Awaiting for their trustie *Vmpires* doome,
 Faulted as false, by him that's ouercome.¹

The bones of this are to be found, of course, as Maitland pointed out, in Virgil, who makes his two singing shepherds challenge each other and make wagers:

experiamur? ego hanc vitulam (ne forte recuses
 bis venit ad mulctram, binos alit ubere fetus)
 depono. . . .

. . . . pocula ponam
 fagina, coelatum divini opus Alcimedontis
 lenta quibus torno facili super addita vitis
 diffusos hedera vestit pallente corymbos . . .
 necdum illis labra admovi, sed cond.ta servo.²

Hall was remembering Virgil, not copying from an open book in front of him, for Menalcas in the Latin is one of the competitors, not the judge; and there seems to be no reason, except a slip of memory, why any alteration should have been made. But, superimposed on Virgil, Hall's mind retained traces of an imitation of the Virgilian passage by Spenser whose work modified the memory of the Latin lines:

Then Loe, Perigot, the Pledge which I plight,
 A mazer ywrought of the Maple warre,
 Wherein is enchased many a fayre sight
 Of Beres and Tygres, that maken fiers warre;
 And over them spred a goodly wild vine,
 Entrailed with a wanton Ivie twine . . .

Per. Thereto will I pawne yonder spotted Lambe,
 Of all my flocke there nis sike another,
 For I brought him up without the Dambe . . .³

¹ *Def. to En.*, 85-96.

² Virgil, *Ecl.*, III, 29-31, 36-43. Maitland further suggests Theocritus as a source. It is true that Hall borrows from Virgil what Virgil borrowed from Theocritus, but Virgil has collected in one place details which are scattered in Theocritus, and there is no clear indication that Hall has gone directly to the Greek.

³ Spenser, *Shep. Cal.* August, 25 *sqq.* It is perhaps worth noting that this passage recurs to Hall's thoughts elsewhere in this poem: 'Nor the low bush feares climbing Yuy twine'. (*Def. to En.* 19.) And when he has occasion to translate Juvenal's

sed nulla aconita bibuntur
 ficitibus; tunc illa times, cum pocula sumes
 gemmata. (X, 25-7.),

Spenser's translation of Virgil's 'pocula' comes to his mind and he writes:

So golden *Mazor* wont suspicion breed,
 Of deadly *Hemlocks* poysoned Potion. (*Def. to En.*, 15-16.)

It is clear that Spenser has reversed in Hall's memory the order in which Virgil mentioned the wagers; that he has added the lamb¹ and the spots; that he has suggested the rhyme *lamb: dam*, which, having entered the compound, brought about the transference of fertility from the 'vitula' itself to its dam; and that the final 'faulting' of the Umpire's decision, which is not to be found in Theocritus, Virgil or Spenser, where the result is a draw which both competitors agree to be just, was very likely suggested by E.K.'s gloss to the 'Emblemes' at the end of the August Eclogue, where we find 'Perigot by his poesie claiming the contest, and Willye not yeelding'.

Examples could be multiplied, but these are sufficient to show that a dismissal of *Virgidemæ* as a mere *cento* of borrowings is quite unjust. Apart from giving readers the fun of solving puzzles, which Hall was at times consciously providing,²—a fact which critics should take into account before they talk about the gloom and pessimism of the satires—this mutual interpenetration of literary reminiscences, though it has not in Hall's work the poetic tension that some modern poets have obtained from it or the imaginative splendour it produced in Coleridge's poetry, nevertheless adds not a little to the polish and intellectual liveliness of *Virgidemæ*. And further, it partly explains why one can return with enjoyment to Hall, whereas Lodge's, Marston's, and even some of the satires printed as Donne's, are read once for curiosity, and re-read, if at all, on business only.

ARNOLD DAVENPORT.

SAMUEL ROWLANDS AND HUMOR'S *ANTIQUÉ FACES*

In 1605 appeared an anonymous collection of epigrams entitled HUMORS / ANTIQUE / FACES. / Drawne in proportion to his severall/Antique Iestures.³ In the opening poem, addressed to the reader, the author announces his intention to flay impartially the humours of his time, regardless of the pleasure or displeasure of his victims. This conventional defiant blast is followed by a more original prologue in which the poet relates how Oberon encountered him and bade him 'scourge the humors of this age', offering for his assistance some fairies who have assumed the 'several forms of

¹ The 'Kid' may have jumped in from line 34 of Virgil's Eclogue.

² See *Virgidemæ*, IV, i, and *A Postscript to the Reader*. Compare also the James Joyceian fun of *Mundus Alter et Idem*, which Milton peevishly called a wretched pilgrimage over Minshew's *Dictionary*.

³ London; printed 'for Henry Rockett'. 8vo in half-sheets.

humors'. Then follow nineteen epigrams, or satirical portraits, after which the poet in an epilogue dismisses the fairies—'changelings of the night'. This epilogue is signed 'E. M.', but no one has ever suggested whose initials these might be, and *Humor's Antique Faces* has remained anonymous.

Another collection of epigrams called HUMORS / LOOKING / Glasse¹ has on its title-page the date 1608 and again no author's name. The name of Samuel Rowlands, however, is signed to the dedication to George Lee and to the address to the reader. Presumably because of the extreme rarity² of *Humor's Antique Faces* it has never been noticed that the last nine of its epigrams appear also in *Humor's Looking Glass*. It is noteworthy that the poems are arranged in the same order in both volumes, but they have not been printed from the same pages of type. The first lines of these epigrams are as follows:

A jolly fellow, Essex born and bred
 A gentleman, a very friend of mine
 Next I will tell you of a poor man's trick
 One of the damned crew that lives by drink
 Come my brave gallant, come, uncase, uncase
 One told a drover that believed it not
 Dick met with Tom, in faith it was their lot
 What's he that stares as if he were afright
 Time serving humor, thou wry-faced ape.³

The problem of the authorship of both books is vitally affected by this discovery. Many explanations are theoretically possible, but the number can be greatly reduced by examining the contents of the books for evidence of authorship. I believe that there is no reason to doubt that Rowlands was the author of *Humor's Looking Glass*. The absence of his name on the title-page is not in itself suspicious, as even his initials rarely appeared on the title-pages of his works, and his initials or (as in this case) his name following a dedication are the

¹ London; printed by 'Ed. Alde for William Ferebrand'. 4to.

² There is one copy in the John Rylands Library in Manchester, one in the Folger Library in Washington, and one in the Huntington Library in San Marino. This last is the only one I have seen.

³ *Humor's Antique Faces*, sigs. C-D3v, and Samuel Rowlands, *Complete Works*, printed for the Hunterian Club (Glasgow, 1880), I, pt. ii, *Humor's Looking Glass*, pp. 13-25. Since the spelling differs in these two books, I have not attempted to preserve it.

usual means of identification. Here we have the additional signature to the address to the reader. Furthermore, the poems look like Rowland's work. The ten that precede and the nine that follow the repeated epigrams are precisely similar in character to the poems in *The Letting of Humor's Blood in the Head Vaine* (1600), *The Knave of Clubs* (1609), or *Good News and Bad News* (1622). The description of the countryman in London, for example, is remarkably like one in *Good News and Bad News*.¹

Is it possible, then, that Rowlands stole nine of the epigrams from one 'E. M.'? There are two objections to this theory. In the first place it is hard to believe that Rowlands brazenly lifted a sequence of nine poems from a rival to publish them as his own. But the poems themselves are the best evidence that Rowlands was their author. Like the other poems in the volume, they are typical of Rowlands' style as we can see it in many other works; and Sir Edmund Gosse even singled out 'Come my brave gallant' as an example of the best of Rowlands' satirical verse.² Thus all of *Humor's Looking Glass* appears to be by Rowlands, and indeed no one has ever thought otherwise.

If this is true, 'E. M.' can be the author of only the first ten poems of *Humor's Antique Faces*. But in them we again find a strong resemblance to Rowlands' acknowledged work. As Rowlands developed, he showed an increasing fondness for long epigrams in pentameter couplets, and especially for epigrams telling an amusing anecdote in a familiar and vivid style. The popular four-line or six-line epigram of the day appears infrequently in Rowlands after 1604. The epigrams in *Humor's Antique Faces* are exclusively of the longer type in pentameter couplets, and one on the jealous man is an anecdote very similar in form to those found in *More Knaves Yet* (1613) or *The Night Raven* (1620).³ The character of the gallant is similar in many details to the descriptions in *The Knave of Clubs* and *More Knaves Yet*.⁴ But the most important general observation to be made is that *Humor's Antique Faces*, like *Humor's Looking Glass*, seems to be all of one piece. The repeated poems do not stand out in either volume as a separate unit.

¹ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. ii; *Humor's Looking Glass*, p. 29; and *Works*, II, pt. ii; *Good News and Bad News*, p. 44.

² Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. i; *Memoir*, p. 16.

³ *Humor's Antique Faces*, sig. B3^r; Rowlands, *Works*, II, pt. i, *More Knaves Yet*, *passim*, but esp. pp. 13-18; also *Works*, II, pt. ii, *The Night Raven*, *passim*, but esp. pp. 25-35.

⁴ *Humor's Antique Faces*, sig. A3; Rowlands, *Works*, II, pt. i, *The Knave of Clubs*, p. 37, and *More Knaves Yet*, p. 28.

A more minute examination of *Humor's Antique Faces* reveals several details of thought and wording which tie it more closely to Rowlands' other works than do the resemblances of style that I have pointed out. The glutton (and also the gallant mentioned above) appear in countless satires and epigrams of the period, but the description¹ of one in *Humor's Antique Faces* is especially related to two previous descriptions by Rowlands. The glutton is referred to in the first line as 'Bachus Cousen', a phrase Rowlands had used in Epigram 34 of *The Letting of Humor's Blood*²; and the line

'God blesse Paules steeples when hee puffes and blowes' is reminiscent of the comparison of the glutton's face to the 'North winde of a mappe' in this same Epigram 34 in *The Letting of Humor's Blood* and in an epigram in *Look to It for I'll Stab Ye* (1604).³

Rowlands' address to the reader in *Humor's Antique Faces* begins:

He that to please all humors doth intend,
May well begin but never make an ende: . . . ⁴

which seems like a reworking of Epigram 4 in *The Letting of Humor's Blood*:

Who seekes to please all men each way,
And not himselfe offende,
He may begin his worke today,
But God knowes when hee'le ende.⁵

Most striking of all are the echoes in *Humor's Looking Glass* of the title of *Humor's Antique Faces*. The dedication of *Humor's Looking Glass* has the couplet:

I make thee a partaker of strange sights,
Drawne antique works of humours vaine delights.⁶

And the address to the reader begins:

As many antique faces passe,
From Barbers chaire unto his glasse, . . . ⁷

From all these pieces of evidence the simplest conclusion to be drawn is that Rowlands was 'E. M.' No known writer of epigrams in this period had these initials or used them habitually as a pseudonym,

¹ *Humor's Antique Faces*, sig. A4.

² Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. i, *The Letting of Humor's Blood*, p. 40.

³ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. ii, *Look to It for I'll Stab Ye*, p. 36.

⁴ *Humor's Antique Faces*, sig. A2.

⁵ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. i, *The Letting of Humor's Blood*, p. 10.

⁶ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. ii, *Humor's Looking Glass*, p. 3. Also compare with this the line: 'I will present strange fashions to you next' in *Humor's Antique Faces*, sig. A2.

⁷ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. ii, *Humor's Looking Glass*, p. 4.

and they make no more arbitrary a pseudonym for Rowlands than did 'W. K.' for John Marston. In one of the two books, then, Rowlands has reprinted a large part of the other.

The next question to be decided is which book came first. We can be reasonably sure that *Humor's Antique Faces* was printed for the first time in 1605, the date on the title-page; for in January of that year Henry Rocket entered it for his copy in the Stationers' Register.¹ *Humor's Looking Glass* does not appear in the Stationers' Register until 1609, when Helen Ferbrand, widow of William Ferbrand, assigned it over to Thomas Archer, along with other books that were her husband's copies.² The only known edition of this book is dated 1608; but with no earlier entry in the Stationers' Register to guide us, we might postulate early lost editions, some of which might even precede *Humor's Antique Faces*.

The history of some of Rowlands' other works may throw light on this problem. Of all his twenty-five major publications only four besides *Humor's Looking Glass* are not entered in the Stationers' Register prior to publication: *Humor's Ordinary* (before 1603?), *The Knave of Clubs* (1609), *A Whole Crew of Kind Gossips* (1609), and *Good News and Bad News* (1622). It has been surmised that *A Whole Crew of Kind Gossips* is a second edition of some previous work now lost.³ We know that *Humor's Ordinary* is another edition of *The Letting of Humor's Blood*, entered in 1600,⁴ and we are reasonably sure that *The Knave of Clubs* is another edition of the lost *Merry Meeting, or T'is Merry When Knaves Meet*, also entered in 1600.⁵ Three of the four seem to be second editions of works that had appeared under different titles, and *Humor's Looking Glass* thus becomes one of two exceptions in Rowlands' bibliography. But in view of the amount of material common to *Humor's Antique Faces* and *Humor's Looking Glass*, it is possible that *Humor's Looking Glass* was also regarded as a sort of second edition of a book already entered in the Stationers' Register. The title-pages of the two books have identical ornamentation as if the printer⁶ were aware of the connec-

¹ Edward Arber [Ed.], *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554-1640 A.D.* (London, 1875-94), III, 279.

² Arber, *Transcript*, III, 419. Pollard and Redgrave suggest (*Short Title Catalogue* [London, 1926], 21386, p. 494) that it was entered to W. White on 16 October, 1600, but this is surely a mistake, as the entry in question (Arber, *Transcript*, III, 174) refers solely to *The Letting of Humor's Blood*.

³ Rowlands, *Works*, I, pt. i, *Memoir*, p. 17.

⁴ Arber, *Transcript*, III, 174.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 171.

⁶ Edward Alde was the printer of *Humor's Looking Glass*, and although his name does not appear on the title-page of *Humor's Antique Faces*, the identity of the

tion. *Humor's Antique Faces* would then be the earlier of the two books, and, in fact, a first edition whose existence explains the curious omission of *Humor's Looking Glass* from the Stationers' Register prior to its publication.¹

The history of the editions of *The Letting of Humor's Blood* and *A Merry Meeting* may also supply a clue to the mystery of Rowlands' signing the initials 'E. M.' to *Humor's Antique Faces*. These two early works were ordered to be burned in 1600 (in accordance with the recent ordinance against satires and epigrams),² and were consequently given different titles when they were reprinted. It is true that Rowlands' name or initials appeared in these reprints and in other works published about the same time, but the difficulties into which his early works got him and his printers might well have frightened him into momentary anonymity when he brought out *Humor's Antique Faces*.

Finally, if *Humor's Antique Faces* is put in the series of Rowlands' collection of epigrams, it will be seen that the device he uses there for introducing the collection is one of many experiments which characterize these books, and, to some extent, differentiate them from the books of epigrams published by Rowlands' contemporaries. In one of the impressions of *The Letting of Humor's Blood* in 1600 Rowlands promised to present the various humours in a paper mirror to his friend Hugh Lee.³ When the book came out as *Humor's Ordinary* the presentation was made by Satir, who, as vintner, offers the poems for the amusement of his guests. Rowlands seems to have decided that such devices gave to his collections a suggestion of unity, as the frame-story did to collections of *novelle*. The next book, *Look to It, for I'll Stab Ye*, is introduced by Death, who defies the world and promises to stab the wicked. Each satirical portrait is

ornaments, the fact that they appear in other books of his besides *Humor's Looking Glass* (in *Look to It*, for example), and the fact that he is known to have been printing for Rocket at this period (Gervase Markham's *English Arcadia* in 1607) all point to him as the printer of *Humor's Antique Faces*.

¹ One would expect some record of the transfer of the copy from Henry Rocket to William Ferbrand, but *The Knaue of Clubs* again provides a precedent. Burby originally entered the copy of *A Merry Meeting* (Arber, *Transcript*, III, 171); yet, without any record of a transfer, Edward Alide printed *The Knaue of Clubs* for William Ferbrand.

² W. W. Greg and E. Boswell [Eds.], *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1576-1602—from Register B* (London, 1930), p. 79. For the ordinance itself see Arber, *Transcript*, III, 677. Various booksellers were later fined for buying *The Letting of Humor's Blood* when it was reissued, contrary to the regulations; see Arber, *Transcript*, II, 832.

³ Rowlands, *Works*, III, 'Miscellaneous Poems', p. 11.

followed by the words 'I'll stab ye', and the book ends with 'Death's Epitaph upon Every Man's Grave'. *Humor's Antique Faces*, one year later, has almost as elaborate a device as this in its prologue and epilogue describing the poet's encounter with Oberon.¹ In *Humor's Looking Glass* Rowlands discards Oberon and returns to a simple dedication, in which, however, he summons the humours to appear before him as if he still had Oberon's magic powers. As in *The Letting of Humor's Blood*, the papers of the book are likened to a mirror—this time a barber's mirror. In substituting this urban comparison for the fairies of *Humor's Antique Faces* Rowlands may have felt that he was bringing his method of presentation into closer harmony with the very urban nature of his epigrams.

Humor's Antique Faces has been distinguished in recent years only by its rarity and its anonymity; of necessity there have been few to praise it 'and very few to love'. Nor do I imagine that the number of its admirers will increase materially in the future, for it is no better and no worse than many other works of minor seventeenth-century satirists. This very mediocrity, however, makes it an appropriate addition to the canon of the prolific pamphleteer, Samuel Rowlands. As typical of his day as the gallants and 'roaring boys' he described, he pleased his large and indiscriminating public with farragoes of the moralist's fury, the poet's whimsy, the salesman's humour, and the reporter's narrative of 'human interest'. Just such a farrago is *Humor's Antique Faces*.

EUGENE M. WAITH

COMPOSITE METAPHORS IN LONGFELLOW'S POETRY

Towards the end of the 'first flight' of the volume 'Birds of Passage', Longfellow revives, in a bold and inspired allegoric poem, the old legend of Sandalphon, the Angel of Prayer:

And he gathers the prayers as he stands,
And they change into flowers in his hands,
Into garlands of purple and red;
And beneath the great arch of the portal,
Through the streets of the City Immortal,
Is wafted the fragrance they shed.

¹ It is possible that Rowlands borrowed the idea of fairies impersonating the humors from Lodge's *Wit's Misery*, where devils incarnate represent the sins and foibles of mankind. John R. Bowman has already suggested ('The Works of Samuel Rowlands', *Harvard University Summaries of Theses*, 1933 [Cambridge, 1934], p. 275), that this book is the source of much of *The Letting of Humor's Blood*.

This miraculous transmutation, transforming prayers into purple-coloured and odorous flowers, is deeply symbolical of Longfellow himself, not only of his moral creed, but of one of his favourite æsthetic procedures, the metaphoric mingling of the various spheres of sensations. He himself is aware of the fascination exerted on him by this old tale of spiritual alchemy:

It is but a legend, I know,—
A fable, a phantom, a show,
Of the ancient Rabbinical lore;
Yet the old mediæval tradition,
The beautiful, strange superstition,
But haunts me and holds me the more.

The psychological fact underlying this legendary transubstantiation, as well as all associations and transfers between the various sensory domains, is commonly known as 'synæsthesia'. The term itself is a rather felicitous compound of the Greek *σύν* + *αἰσθάνομαι*, and was coined in France towards the end of the last century. The Shorter *O.E.D.* defines it as 'production, from a sense-impression of one kind, of an associated mental image of a sense-impression of another kind'. It is a somewhat unobtrusive and elusive phenomenon, but its influence is none the less profound, far-reaching and universal. Through Goethe, Locke and Galileo, it can be traced as far back as Democritus; and it has played a notable rôle in the history of various branches of human activity.

From the *psychological* point of view, synæsthesia covers the wide field of intersensorial associations, based on some sort of similarity or contiguity between the two, or more, sensations intermixed.¹ It includes in particular the semi-pathological cases of 'audition colorée', where acoustic impressions are spontaneously associated with visual images. The famous baritone Titta Ruffo, *e.g.*, used to speak of 'brown, red, and blue sounds'; Rimbaud wrote a poem on the colour of vowels ('Les Voyelles'); Franz List often staggered his orchestra at Weimar by asking for 'bluer tones'. Various explanations have been advanced to account for these phenomena; they include among others a psychoanalytic approach; an attempt to distinguish a special 'synæsthetic type' (Anschuetz); Kuelpe's suggestion that synæsthesia is a case of illusion or hallucination; and a shrewd

¹ For bibliographies, see the exhaustive lists in the monographs of F. Mahling (*Arch. f. d. ges. Psychologie* LVII, 165) and A. Wellek (*ibid.*, LXXIX, 325). Cf. also C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards: *The Meaning of Meaning*, 5th ed., 1938, pp. 143, 156. Many aspects of synæsthesia are illuminatingly discussed by Prof. Irving Babbitt in his 'New Laokoon'.

analysis by H. Héraut of Rimbaud's 'vowel-colours', showing that the colours he attributed to the various vowel-sounds were the same in which the corresponding letters were painted in the spelling-book used by the poet in his childhood.¹

For the student of *language*, synæsthesia denotes a fairly frequent type of change of meaning, better known since Wundt as 'complicative sense-change'. Owing to associations existing between various sense-impressions, adjectives and other words are often transferred, figuratively or even permanently, from one sensory province to another. Metaphoric expressions like 'piercing sound', 'warm colour', 'couleur criarde', etc., sometimes give rise to lasting changes of meaning, either in the form of several acceptations living on side by side, as e.g. the English word 'soft', or in the form of a radical sense-substitution, illustrated by the German adjective 'hell', which means 'light' but derives from the verb 'hallen: to ring'.² By the same process, 'dur' and 'moll' have been transferred from the domain of touch into musical terminology.

In the field of *æsthetics*, synæsthesia is inextricably interwoven with the age-old problem of the delimitation and interdependence of the various branches of art. Greek metaphors describing painting as 'silent poetry' indicate that the discarding of watertight partitions began at a very early period, perhaps as a result of the Pythagorean speculations about the 'music of the spheres'. In the early eighteenth century, the *Mercure de France* reported the invention of a clavichord for colours. Lessing's attempts in the *Laokoon* to isolate the various provinces of art did not succeed in stemming the inherent tendency towards a more synoptic interpretation of æsthetics, which culminated in Schopenhauer's and Wagner's conception of the 'Gesamtkunstwerk' and in Whistler's impressionistic harmonies, and was revived of late by the 'Musicalistic School' of Henri Valensi.³

These revolutionary changes did not fail to have profound repercussions in poetry proper. Synæsthesia, if soberly and skilfully handled, affords excellent opportunities for the poet, both because it has the charm and glamour of novelty and surprise, and because it enables him to describe his object from more than one angle, or, as

¹ H. Héraut: 'Du nouveau sur Rimbaud' (*Nouvelle Revue Française*, 1934, 602).

² W. Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie*, I, 2, 540; H. Falk, *Betydningslaere* (Kristiania, 1920, 61); G. Stern, 'Meaning and Change of Meaning' (*Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, 1931).

³ H. Valensi, 'L'allègement progressif de la matière à travers l'évolution de l'art' (*Journal de Psychologie*, XXXI, 159); and *Le Musicalisme* (Paris, 1936).

Leibniz put it, 'to look at the same town from various standpoints'.¹ Its use in poetry is of course as old as poetry itself; but in the course of the last century, two distinct vogues of synæsthesia seem to have swept over Europe, and the second of these vogues has not yet subsided. The first climax came with the Romantic Movement, the poetry of Coleridge, Keats, Byron, Tieck and E. T. A. Hoffmann, some of whom seem to have suffered from an almost pathological acuteness of synæsthetic sensations, prompted perhaps by the enjoyment of opium.² The second vogue was heralded by Théophile Gautier's 'Symphonie en Blanc Majeur' and 'Club des Haschichins'; it came into its own with the poetry of Baudelaire, Verlaine, the symbolist school,³ and the decadent novels of Huysmans (*cf.* the 'organ of perfumes' in *A Rebours*), and found its æsthetic code in Baudelaire's 'Correspondances':

'Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent.
Il est des parfums frais comme des chairs d'enfants,
Doux comme les hautbois, verts comme les prairies . . .'

The fashion of far-fetched and super-refined synæsthetic images became an attribute of the 'decadent movement', and quickly spread from France to England,⁴ where it produced a new type of metaphor, extremely current in the poetry of the 'nineties: similes like Wilde's 'green thirst' ('Ballad of Reading Gaol'), Stephen Phillips' 'greenly silent night' ('Marpessa'), Ernest Dowson's 'white music' ('Pierrot'), or Arthur Symonds' 'audible odours' ('The Opium-smoker').⁵ Nor did these *concelli* share in the fate of other fin-de-siècle devices; in a slightly altered but scarcely less far-fetched form, they are still playing a conspicuous part in the imagery of modern poetry, in particular in the works of the 'New Writing' group.

The bulk of Longfellow's literary activity fell within a period when the vogue of synæsthesia was at a rather low ebb between its two high-water-marks towards the beginning and the end of the nine-

¹ E. Binet, 'Le problème de l'audition colorée' (*Revue des Deux-Mondes* 113, 586); Dromard, 'Les Transpositions sensorielles dans la langue littéraire' (*Journal de Psychologie*, IV, 492).

² E. Dowdney, 'Literary Synæsthesia' (*The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, XI, 490).

³ See V. Ségalen, 'Les Synæsthésies et l'école symboliste' (*Mercure de France*, IV, 57); A. Schinz, 'Literary Symbolism in France' (*P.M.L.A.*, XVIII, 273).

⁴ For a comprehensive, though somewhat incomplete survey of synæsthesia in English literature, see E. v. Siebold's monograph in *E. St.*, LIII.

⁵ For further examples, *cf.* my paper on 'Synæsthesia in the English Decadents' (*Archivum Philologicum*, 1939, 173); *cf. also* G. Turquet-Milnes, 'The Influence of Baudelaire in France and England' (London, 1913).

teenth century. Nor were his usual subject-matter, his imagination, and his artistic outlook in general, of a kind to encourage an over-indulgence in intersensorial images. On the other hand, his long and distinguished association with the academic study of languages and literatures, his keen interest in the problems of verbal expression (seen also from his extensive work as a translator), and last but not least, his constant preoccupation with questions of æsthetics and poetic inspiration, must have gone a long way to predispose him to use synæsthetic metaphors more frequently than poets of his temperament usually do. The following selection of some of his more striking sense-transfers should give an idea of the range, novelty and picturesqueness of his synæsthetic images:¹

Transfers of touch.

Till the beauty of its stillness
Overflowed me, like a tide.

(*'To the River Charles'*, p. 27)

. . . while the bell from its turret
Sprinkled with holy sounds the air.

(*'Evangeline'*, I, 1, p. 108)

Whose innumerable echoes
Flap like eagles in their cyries.

(*'Hiawatha'*, Introduction, p. 256)

Heavy with the heat and silence
Grew the afternoon of Summer.

(*'Hiawatha'*, XXII, p. 312)

Transfers of heat.

Like an icicle, its sheen
Is cold and keen.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, *'The Saga of King Olaf'*, VIII, p. 368)

The cold light of stars.

(*'The Light of Stars'*, p. 11)

¹ All quotations refer to the Chandos Classics edition of the *Poems of Longfellow*. It should be noted that the examples include, not only 'complete' or 'implicit' synæsthesias, like 'a mist of rhyme' or 'cool the sound of the brook', but also 'partial' or 'explicit' ones, like 'tones pure and tender as a summer night'. The difference between the two types is more than grammatical. The presence or absence of any explicit reference to the fact that the speaker is deliberately making use of a simile or metaphor is indicative of a different degree of consciousness, a different level of association. Nevertheless, the psychological background, the process of association through similarity or contiguity, is in both cases identical in quality if not in quantity. It should, therefore, be more expedient to treat both types under the same heading.

And the words of that fatal song
Come over me like a chill.

(*'My Lost Youth'*, p. 472)

And cool the sound of the brook.

(*'The Golden Legend'*, IV, p. 207)

Transfers of taste.

For that grim tragedy of mine,
As strong and black as Spanish wine.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, 'Interlude', p. 410)

The air of summer was sweeter than wine.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, 'The Saga of King Olaf', IV, p. 362)

Transfers of scent.

. . . the stalks he gave her with a gracious gesture,
And with words as pleasant as their own perfume.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, 'The Saga of King Olaf', XVI, p. 374)

Gascon, s'il en fût jamais,
Parfumé de poésie.

(*'Noel'*, p. 431)

Transfers of sound.

Like the swell of some sweet tune,
Morning rises into noon.

(*'Maidenhood'*, p. 32)

Till their chimes in sweet collision
Mingled with each wandering vision.

(*'The Belfry of Bruges'*, p. 30)

Poured out their souls in odours, that were their prayers and confessions.

(*'Evangeline'*, II, 3, p. 130)

Transfers of sight.

A voice fell, like a falling star.

(*'Excelsior'*, p. 46)

For who has sight so keen and strong,
That it can follow the flight of song?

(*'The Arrow and the Song'*, p. 50)

Your name is ever green in Alcalá.

(*'The Spanish Student'*, III, 3, p. 92)

Starry silence.

(*'Evangeline'*, I, 2, p. 110)

But on the breath of the summer winds a rumour was wafted
Sweeter than song of bird, or hue or odour of blossom.

(*'Evangeline'*, II, 4, p. 134)

The flowing draperies of his song.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, 'Interlude', p. 345)

. . . at first the tones were pure

And tender as a summer night.

(*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, 'Interlude', p. 402)

The melody and even the words were intermingled with my thought,
As bits of coloured thread are caught and woven into nests of birds.

(*'Kéramos'*, p. 454)

These choristers with lips of stone,
Whose music is not heard, but seen.

(*'Kéramos'*, p. 456)

Up soared the lark into the air,
A shaft of song, a wingéd prayer.

(*'The Sermon of St. Francis'*, p. 489)

Into this little mist of rhyme.

(*'Castles in Spain'*, p. 494)

Songs flush with purple bloom the rye.

(*'Robert Burns'*, p. 505)

Longfellow's synæsthetic metaphors excel in quality rather than in numbers. In spite of their exquisite beauty and appropriateness, they occur fairly seldom and are not allowed to degenerate into a stereotyped device. Their total number in the Chandos Classics volume of Longfellow's poems scarcely exceeds a hundred. Translations and trite similes like 'sweet sound' are of course excluded from this number; nevertheless, it remains relatively small, especially if compared with the 414 synæsthesias which I have noted in Wilde, and the 302 examples collected from one half of William Morris's poetry.¹ But the boldness, brilliance and variety of the metaphors amply compensates for their comparative rareness. Naturally, they cannot match the involved and exotic devices of Romantic or Symbolist sense-transfers, the intricate imagery of a Keats or a Swinburne; but they mark an important stage in the intermediary period, and are incomparably superior to the corresponding material which I have collected in William Morris, himself a past master in descriptive and decorative effects.

A comparison with other poets is equally instructive with regard

¹ Cf. *Archivum Philologicum*, 1939, 176.

to the *psychological value* of Longfellow's transfers. An analysis of the part played by the various sensory domains as sources or termini of these transfers leads to results substantially identical with those obtained for Morris, Wilde and the poets of the 'nineties. Most of them are borrowed from touch-sensations (52 out of 104), and the overwhelming majority are directed towards the province of acoustic sensations (73 out of 104). Consequently, out of the thirty theoretically possible cases, the transfer from touch to sound is by far the most frequent and represents by itself more than one-third of the total amount (36 out of 104). In general, transfers tend to point from the lower levels of the sensorium (touch, heat, taste) towards the higher ones (sound, sight), and not *vice-versa*; yet there are twenty-six visual images transferred one remove lower, to the sphere of sound. The reason for the predominance of acoustic sensations as the destination of the transfers is probably to be sought in the comparative scarcity of adjectives and images descriptive of sound-impressions. Visual terminology is well provided with adjectives, similes, and other adequate devices of graphic representation; the acoustic sphere, however, is rather short of such material and must therefore resort to borrowings from other categories of the sensorium. Since the analysis of various widely different poets has invariably led to this result, it seems to be a sort of inherent psychologic regularity among synæsthetic associations and does not reflect any particular feature in the mental make-up of the individual poet. On the other hand, the rôle played by olfactory sensations seems to be less rigidly determined by hard-and-fast rules; and their extreme rareness in Longfellow contrasts rather sharply with the symbolist perfume-associations in *A Rebours* and *Dorian Gray*, and with Arthur Symonds' 'audible odours' and 'scented billows of soft thunder' ('Bianca', V).

Synæsthesia can serve various purposes in Longfellow's poetry. In his dramas, it plays a subordinate and rather insignificant part; in his narrative poetry, it may be of occasional value, especially in vague and strongly suggestive passages like some parts in 'Hiawatha' or the 'Saga of King Olaf', which were quoted above. For lyrical poetry, it is an extremely precious asset whenever impressionistic effects are aimed at, as in the 'Belfry of Bruges', and whenever æsthetic problems are under discussion, as in the above-mentioned examples from 'Kéramos', 'Robert Burns', or the various 'interludes' in *Tales of a Wayside Inn*.

All these manifold uses of synæsthetic images can be reduced to two fundamental patterns. The association between the old and the new sense-perception can reside in some similar features: thus, in the poem 'Excelsior', a descending voice is likened to a falling star, and in the 'Sermon of St. Francis', the soaring lark is said to be reminiscent of a 'shaft of song'. This is the first main type. The second consists in association, not by similarity, but by contiguity. Thus, 'starry silence', in 'Evangeline', does not mean that the 'silence' was in any way similar to 'starlight', but that the two sensations, one acoustic and one visual, coexisted in the perception, and instead of separating them by means of a copula—'starlight *and* silence'—they were blended into one composite impression which is intended to convey the fundamental unity and the 'atmosphere' of the scene. Another example in point is a passage from the 'Warden of the Cinque Ports'. 'Darker grew and deeper the silence and the gloom'.¹

It is obvious that these involved and startling metaphors, heavily charged with emotional undertones and evocatory effects, are particularly suitable for the description of vague, uncanny, semi-visionary states of mind. In addition to those already mentioned, a good example of this can be found in 'The Birds of Killingworth' (*Tales of a Wayside Inn*, p. 389):

As in an idiot's brain remembered words
Hang empty 'mid the cobwebs of his dreams!

Yet the most graphic type of Longfellow's composite metaphors, and the one which bears most lastingly his personal cachet, is the way he describes purely æsthetic impressions; as, for example, the 'flower of song blooming on' ('Beautiful Lily', p. 425), and the 'visible though inaudible music' of Luca della Robbia's choristers, in 'Kéramos'. The most remarkable quality of these complicated images is the natural ease and spontaneity with which they come to the poet, and with which they are understood and accepted by the reader. Bold and arresting as they are, they never lapse into the abstruse affectations and dandified mannerisms common to the English and French decadents, which at one time brought synæsthesia into discredit and provoked the caustic strictures set forth in Nordau's famous book on degeneration. Here too, Longfellow

¹ For attempts to derive synæsthesia at large from the 'unity of perception', see, *inter alia*, Larsson, *Poetiens Logik* (Stockholm, 1922, 4th ed., 114); Souriau, *L'Imagination de l'artiste* (Paris, 1901, 96); Van Ginneken, 'Het Gevoel in Taal en Woordkunst' (*Leuvense Bijdragen*, X, 127); Falk, *loc. cit.*

remained true to himself: limpid and natural, graceful and simple, easily accessible to all. Like the young Sicilian in the 'Prelude' to *Tales of a Wayside Inn*, his 'melodies and measures were fraught with sunshine and the open air'. His original and none-the-less sober handling of the inexhaustible resources of intersensorial association shows how much a poet can achieve in this field without defeating his own ends by trying to dazzle his audience with a far-fetched and esoteric imagery.

S. ULLMANN.

AN EMENDATION IN THE TEXT OF WORDSWORTH

At the beginning of *The Excursion*, where the poet first sees the Wanderer, 'recumbent in the shade', with an iron-pointed staff at his side, we are told that the staff

Afforded, to the figure of the man
Detained for contemplation or repose,
Graceful support. (Book I, ll. 41-3.)

'Graceful' is a strange, if not a pointless, epithet, and the late James Morison, who was for many years librarian of the Indian Institute at Oxford, suggested 'Grateful', which has point. Compare at the end of the fourth book, l. 1,319,

A grateful couch was spread for our repose.

PERCY SIMPSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF *R.E.S.*

DEAR SIR,—

Trollope's *Phineas Redux*

In recent numbers of the *Review*, Dr. Chapman and Mr. Bone have been debating why the Duchess of Omnium refers to her husband's scheme of decimal coinage in the words 'those horrible two farthings'. The true explanation may be found in vol. 1, p. 278 of the World's Classics edition of *Phineas Redux*—'how he might best reconcile the forty-eight farthings which go to a shilling with that thorough-going useful decimal, fifty'.

Yours faithfully,

H. F. SUMMERS.

REVIEWS

The Divine Science. The Æsthetic of some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets. By LEAH JONAS. New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. London: H. Milford. 1941. Pp. xii+292. 20s. net.

Miss Jonas has attempted to trace the evolution of a theory of poetry during the seventeenth-century. Unfortunately the materials for such a study are scanty. Professor Saintsbury, in his monumental *History of Criticism*, writes:

The middle third, if not the whole first half, of the seventeenth century in England was too much occupied with civil and religious broils to devote attention to such a subject as literary criticism. Between the probable date of Jonson's *Timber* (1625-37) and the certain one of Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668) we have practically nothing substantive save the interesting prefatory matter to *Gondibert* (1650).

In order to fill this gap Miss Jonas has selected some of the scattered utterances of the poets themselves. A selection of this kind needs to be made with careful discrimination. Not all such utterances express a considered view of the nature of poetry; often they are prompted by a particular occasion and serve a limited purpose, they cannot always be taken to express the poet's serious opinion. Miss Jonas does not sufficiently allow for this; for instance, on p. 260 she writes:

An interesting review of Denham's ideas concerning the nature of poetry occurs in his *Humble Petition of the Poets to the Five Members of the Honourable House of Commons*.

But Denham, in the verses from which she proceeds to quote, is merely using certain commonplaces about poets which had been current since Plato, in order to satirize the Five Members. Poets are licensed liars, but at least they administer poetic justice; the members lie like the poets, but lack the compensating virtue. This tells us nothing of Denham's 'ideas concerning the nature of poetry'. Too often Miss Jonas overlooks the poet's intention in her zeal to discover his theory of poetry. On p. 203 she asserts that Donne was dissatisfied with the drama, and she suggests an ingenious explanation:

His dissatisfaction with the drama, for which he assigns no reason, is probably another illustration of his aversion to a form of art in which

passion is objective and romanticized rather than subjective and realistic; the drama, too, was a form in which a conventional concept of love was thoroughly established and usually followed.

The reader will naturally want to know what evidence there is of Donne's dissatisfaction. He is referred to *Satire II*. The central attack in that poem is against lawyers; poets are satirized by the way as being bad enough, yet infinitely less obnoxious than the men of law. Among the poets, the dramatists are given six lines:

One, (like a wretch, which at Barre judg'd as dead,
Yet prompts him which stands next, and cannot reade,
And saves his life) gives ideot actors meanes
(Starving himselfe) to live by his labors sceanes;
As in some Organ, Puppits dance above
And bellows pant below, which them do move.

If this is to be taken to prove that Donne was dissatisfied with the drama, then there is equal evidence in the satire that he was dissatisfied with all poetry.

Besides sometimes ignoring the immediate context of the lines she quotes or refers to, Miss Jonas is not always fully aware of the wider context, the contemporary history of thought. She speaks of the poet Davenant as a disciple of Hobbes, and Hobbes' theory of knowledge and his views about the function of imagery may well have an important bearing on the theory and practice of poetry. But the reader's confidence in her ability to measure and interpret this relation is shaken when she goes on to tell us:

Davenant liked to refer to the poet as nature's secretary. From nature, which is the course of life as we know it, we can by experience reason out the ideal state of life originally intended for man, from which he has lapsed and towards which he should strive, a state characterized by purity in love, active courage, justice on the part of superiors, and loyalty among subordinates.

This notion of an ideal state of nature from which man has lapsed is so far removed from Hobbes' conception of the state of nature that Davenant, if he held it, can hardly be described as his disciple.

It is a difficult and dangerous undertaking to try to discover the evolution of poetic theory from the chance utterances of the poets. The scholar who attempts it needs not only wide knowledge, but also sensitive appreciation of poetry. Here and there Miss Jonas reveals an impercipience which disqualifies her for so difficult a task. On p. 221 she explains:

Herbert's writing is so sincere a reflection of his life as to be an index

to his physical and spiritual health. His disappointments and discouragements were mirrored in a ragged technique very different from the smoothness of expression which he strove to attain.

Her reference is to *Deniall* where the 'raggedness' is, of course, a deliberate and characteristic technical device, not an 'index to physical or mental' ill health. A similar obtuseness is shown in Miss Jonas' objection to what she oddly calls Professor Grierson's 'severe criticism' of Herrick's religious poetry, which is in fact not a criticism at all, but an accurate description. It is quoted on p. 240:

Herrick does not approach God with the earnest pleading of Herbert, rapt love of Crashaw, or mystic awe of Vaughan, but artless frankness of a child confessing his naughtiness and asking to escape too severe a penalty.

Upon which Miss Jonas comments

It would be much more to the point to suggest that his religious ideas are those of a man of the eighteenth century.

Such a suggestion would seem to most readers wholly misleading. But while she is captious with Professor Grierson, she is too naively impressed by a remark of M. Legouis', which that scholarly critic would certainly not have thought of as recording an important discovery: 'Legouis points out that Marvell's most powerful love poem has a rigidly logical structure': a fact that can hardly have escaped the notice of even the least erudite reader of *To his Coy Mistress*.

These are only some of the symptoms of Miss Jonas' unfitness for the very difficult task she has undertaken. If diligent reading and an eager pursuit of knowledge could have achieved the end in view, Miss Jonas would have achieved it. But curiosity and industry, valuable though they are, are insufficient for her purpose. Whether of her own volition or under some external compulsion, she has embarked on a quest for which she is not yet sufficiently equipped. In pursuing it she has doubtless gained valuable training. In addition she has earned the gratitude of anyone who may wish to follow the same quest, by directing attention to some pathways that lead into the morass and to others that may lead to solid ground. But it will need a scholar of riper judgment and wider knowledge to discover whether or no 'the theory underlying the work of representative poets can be traced and used to obtain a broader understanding of seventeenth-century poetic evolution.'

JOAN BENNETT.

Milton's Contemporary Reputation. By WILLIAM RILEY PARKER. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press. 1940. Pp.xii +299.

This volume is another valuable contribution of Professor Parker's to Milton studies. It consists of an essay on Milton's Contemporary Reputation, followed by a List of Printed Allusions (1641-74), and by facsimile reproductions of five contemporary pamphlets written in answer to Milton—*A Modest Confutation* (1642), *An Answer to The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (1644), *Filmer's Observations on Milton Against Salmasius* (1652), *The Censure of the Rota upon Milton's Book* (1660)—which Parker places in its proper light—and L'Estrange's *No Blinde Guides* (1660). Parker confesses that he has been unable to make his list of Milton allusions as full as he had wished; but he has collected, sifted and arranged the allusions noted by Todd, Masson, Stern, Raymond and French, adding some dozen discoveries of his own, and has so laid the foundation for the Milton Allusion Book which is a desideratum. He notes that the period 1653-74 is the one most likely to reward further research. One regrets that he has confined himself to allusions printed during Milton's life, thus excluding letters and diaries written but not printed at the time.

The theme of the essay is that Masson and others have grossly exaggerated Milton's contemporary reputation, both literary and political, confusing it with his subsequent fame. This is the story Parker tells. Milton in youth was ambitious of poetic fame, but throughout the Cambridge and Horton periods his name was scarcely known outside his small circle of friends. When he took to pamphleteering he became ambitious of political fame and influence, but with no greater success. His five anti-prelatical tracts failed to bring him into prominence. The first of his tracts to catch the public attention was *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, which made him notorious rather than famous; the divorce tracts had no immediate practical effect, nor did the *Areopagitica*, although Parker contradicts Haller's statement that the latter went unnoticed. In 1645, towards the close of this first phase of his pamphleteering, Milton published his *Poems*, hoping (Parker suggests) that they might yet bring him the fame his pamphlets had failed to bring. But the *Poems* also failed to attract attention; the edition was not exhausted more than a dozen years later. This neglect, Parker observes, should not be attributed to political conditions; for the poems of Waller, Crashaw and Suckling, also published at this time by Moseley, went through three or

four editions before Milton's reached a second in 1673. To this one replies that Waller, Crashaw and Suckling were all associated with the courts of Charles and Henrietta Maria, which may well account for the larger circulation of their verse. At the next point in the story Parker shuffles a little uncomfortably; for he has now to tell how this 'obscure Milton', who had fallen quiet during the years 1646-8, was suddenly in 1649 appointed Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Council of State. 'In spite of the anti-climax of his quarrel with the bishops, in spite of the divorce scandal, in spite of the futility of *Areopagitica*, Milton had attracted to himself persons who not only believed in him but also possessed the power to actuate their faith' (the writer presumably means 'could act on their faith'). With the publication of *Eikonoklastes* the obscure free-lance emerges as champion in the front of the battle; with the publication of *Defensio Prima* he becomes a European figure. The sensation produced, however, by Milton's reply to Salmasius was, according to Parker, something of a nine days' wonder; the *Defensio Secunda* and *Defensio Pro Se*, in which he tried to follow up his success, misfired, and the great controversy went out in a smother of smoke. For three years after August 1655 Milton again fell silent; then, immediately after the death of Cromwell, he re-published *Defensio Prima*, 'a clear bid for remembrance, issued at a critical time when the government had changed hands'. Next year he resumed his pamphleteering, and on the very eve of the Restoration issued his *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*. Parker represents Milton at this point as actuated by the vain ambition to reassert the power and authority he imagined himself to have wielded under Cromwell. 'Ironically unaware that he was emerging from something like obscurity', he merely succeeded in reminding possible enemies of the existence of the author of *Eikonoklastes* and *Defensio Prima*; 'after the King's return, therefore, the blind rebel was conspicuous enough to be imprisoned and to have two of his books suppressed, but inconspicuous enough to escape additional punishment'. (The plain fact is of course that Milton was not among the dozen regicides who were alone excepted from the King's mercy.) Milton now retired into private life and 'became an almost legendary figure'. In 1667 appeared *Paradise Lost*, which 'probably created no sensation'; probably not, but it impressed Dryden and the small circle of critics who made literary reputations. Parker has to admit, although his insistence on Milton's obscurity makes it appear paradoxical, that in the closing

years 'publishers were evidently believing that anything from the pen of Milton would have readers'. This belated literary success, he thinks, revived in Milton the old 'insatiable longing for immediate fame through political reform', resulting in the final pamphlet *Of True Religion*. He makes much of the fact that two books in Latin published in these last years, *Artis Logicae* and *Epistolarum Familiarium*, bear on their title-pages *Joannis Miltoni Angli*, 'the form of identifying himself which he had used in the three Defences'; this suggests to Parker that Milton is hankering after the faded glory of the days of his encounter with Salmasius—'the unreconstructed (*sic*) rebel was yearning once more for the excitement of controversy, the plaudits of men across the Channel'. How else, one asks, should Milton describe himself in Latin? In conclusion Parker comments on the rapid growth of Milton's fame in the twenty-five years following his death, a phenomenon which Parker's previous story fails to account for. Five separate lives of Milton were written before 1700; in 1688 appeared the splendid edition of *Paradise Lost* to which five hundred distinguished Englishmen subscribed; two editions of the complete prose appeared before the end of the century. This posthumous history is surely a better index to Milton's contemporary reputation than the 'dearth of printed allusions to *Paradise Lost* in the period 1667-74'. Parker, however, is more concerned to use the fact of the growth of Milton's posthumous fame to account for the growth of the legend of Milton's political importance. Those who valued his verse began to look into the prose; others, whigs and republicans, discovered in his prose writings the most eloquent expression of their political ideas and sentiments: both sorts of readers tended to take Milton at his own political valuation, and hence arose the 'legend of Milton the Statesman' which Masson was to consummate.

If Masson exaggerates Milton's contemporary renown, Parker exaggerates his obscurity and ineffectualness. Parker's story suffers from the over-emphasis of the counterblast. Starting from Masson, he tends always to be arguing against him rather than reconsidering the case on its merits; so much so that he tends, ironically enough, to identify the case with Masson's view of it. The consequent disparity between pretensions and achievements leads him to represent Milton's life as a tale of frustrated ambitions, of ambitions pathetically maintained in spite of perpetual failure. To obtain a true picture we must forget Masson and 'the legend of Milton the Statesman'.

Mere writers, it can be agreed, rarely if ever exercise a controlling influence on contemporary events; their main account is with the future, as they themselves know even while they seek and desire current success. And the future rewards them handsomely with retrospective dividends; for they generally convince later generations that their words prevailed at the time 'in a troubled sea of noises and hoarse disputes' as they now prevail 'in the quiet and still air of delightful studies'. This fallacy of taking words for deeds is natural to literary history and needs guarding against not only in Milton's case. Having eliminated this fallacy it remains to judge how far Milton did actually achieve the reputation and success open to a writer. Parker relies on the evidence of editions and printed allusions, but he deliberately slights the other evidence. Thus he does his best to whittle down the importance of the facts that Milton, who had no political connections, was appointed Secretary for Foreign Tongues and official apologist to the Commonwealth Government, that his name became widely known on the Continent, and that two of his books were burnt after the Restoration; yet these were effects of his pamphleteering, and they should be allowed their proper value as positive evidence of his reputation and success. As for his poetic reputation, Milton up to the time of the Italian tour was a student living in retirement in the country and without those court connections through which poets might hope to make their names; yet his friendship with Lawes the court musician, the success of *Comus* (to which Lawes and Wotton bear witness), and the fact that he contributed to the memorial volume to Edward King—all of which evidence Parker again deliberately slights—suggest that he may have been on the verge of establishing a poetic reputation; had war not come, a volume of poems by Milton in 1645 might have made more stir. Parker does well to point out that Milton was not in fact at this time widely known as a poet; he goes beyond his brief by arguing that political conditions had nothing to do with it. On his treatment of the fame of the author of *Paradise Lost* I have already sufficiently commented.

The correction of a long-established view almost inevitably results in the kind of counter-bias I have criticized in Professor Parker's essay; and he himself is modestly aware of the difficulties and dangers of his subject. The great value of his book is that it clears the way for a just estimate of Milton's contemporary reputation.

B. A. WRIGHT.

The Letters of Joseph Addison. Edited by WALTER GRAHAM. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1941. Pp. xxxvi+527. 30s. net.

'The charm of Addison's letters is so great', wrote Macaulay in his observations on Lucy Aikin's *Life* (1843), 'that a second edition of this work may probably be required'. Few will be disposed to echo Macaulay's praise, especially after a complete reading of the 700 letters brought together by Professor Walter Graham. There is little of charm in Addison's letters, save in those which he sent home during the years of his protracted continental tour, 1699-1704. It is of interest to note that a few of these early letters were later drawn upon for the *Tatler* and the *Guardian*; and it was in the writing of essays turning upon the social life of his day that the genius of Addison found a natural outlet. Within about two years of his return from his travels he became an Under-Secretary of State, and thereafter, until near the end, he held offices which immersed him in state affairs; and most of the letters collected by Professor Graham are official or business communications, a number of them dictated documents. The proportion of Addison's letters which bear out Macaulay's rash dictum is small indeed. Even when addressing himself to friends the gifts of humour, apt phrase, and easy familiarity seem to have deserted him after the period of his continental travels. Thereafter he is chiefly to be found as the competent, industrious public servant, upright and correct, but with an eye always to the main chance, his own advancement, and the legal perquisites of office. He becomes easier of approach, but hardly a friendly figure, and certainly not Macaulay's paragon who deserved 'as much love and esteem as can be justly claimed by any of our infirm and erring race'.

If, on the whole, these letters do not add materially to the portrait of Addison as a man, they do bring us, as Professor Graham claims, 'revision or documentation of accepted facts about him'. And, it should be added, they are of value in their illustration of public affairs, and of people, whether in important or minor station, connected with the administration in England and Ireland. Further, it is a revelation to note how little literary pursuits are reflected in this correspondence. The *Spectator* is mentioned in one letter only. Even when all allowance has been made for the absence of letters to correspondents unoccupied with public business the result is unexpected.

A great merit of Miss Aikin's *Life of Addison* was the trouble she took to recover and print as many letters as she could find. Over 200 additional letters were printed in Bohn's depressingly produced

edition of the *Works*. Seeking far and wide, Professor Graham has been able to add more than 280 letters, here printed for the first time, and he gives in abstract over 270 letters, of which only fifty have been listed before. The unpublished material, whether large groups or single letters, is drawn from some thirty different sources. An important collection is that containing Addison's letters to Joshua Dawson, Secretary to the Lord Justices of Ireland. These are printed from transcripts of the originals, which have since been destroyed. Another large group is to be found among the manuscripts of the Duke of Manchester. Many of these interesting and valuable news letters to Charles Montagu, fourth Earl of Manchester, addressed to him 1707-8, when he was serving as Ambassador Extraordinary to Venice, have been printed elsewhere, but they are here more completely presented. There are letters to William King, Archbishop of Dublin, which, together with the Dawson correspondence, are of special Irish interest. Of a different character are those letters among the Egerton MSS. in the British Museum addressed by Addison to the trustees of the property of his brother, Gulston Addison, who died in Madras. This was an exasperating business, and these letters illustrate Addison's persistence, as does the fact, not always remembered, that he made his own way to the distinguished position of Secretary of State for the Southern Department when he was forty-five.

Although the textual standards adopted by Miss Aikin and Bohn, when printing letters from manuscript, were not those to satisfy modern scholarship, it can be said that, on the whole, they reproduced what was written. Their methods differed. Bohn frankly normalized his text. Miss Aikin was erratic, and frequently introduced contractions and archaisms to give letters a more antique dress than that worn by the original. Professor Graham's text reproduces, as far as print will serve, the symbols, contractions, spelling, and punctuation of the originals, even in the case of drafts and copies by other hands than Addison's. Whether much is gained for the modern student by this meticulous method, now that the art of photography can be summoned to our help, is open to question. Professor Graham claims in justification of his own practice, that Addison's use of contractions 'indicated degrees of familiarity or informality not otherwise expressed'. But a scrutiny of the letters hardly bears this out. A letter to Steele, incorrectly described as the only one known, has no more than two contractions. Or, to choose another example, there is

the contrast between two letters written to Edward Wortley within a few days of each other, 27 April, 1 May, 1708, the one full of contractions, the other, save for the hasty postscript, with but one. In spelling, punctuation and the contraction of common words Addison's practice was not consistent. Whatever the merits of exact reproduction versus normalization it seems an overstatement to claim that the former method captures for the modern reader 'the individual flavour of Addison's letters'. But every correspondence has its own problems, the editor is entitled to weigh alternatives, and he should then, as Professor Graham does, state his practice and observe it.

Professor Graham might, with advantage, have extended the four pages in which he gives some account of the past history of the correspondence and of his own labours. He has printed over 280 more letters in complete form than were contained in Bohn's edition, and gathered them from widely scattered sources. He has indicated the source at the end of each letter, but he has provided the student with no ready means of knowing the total content of each source. If he had added to his tabular 'List of Letters' two columns showing the original source, printed source or transcript, used for each letter, such as those provided by Leonard Whibley in the Clarendon Press edition of Gray's letters, he would have earned the gratitude of the more inquiring reader. And, again, it would have been useful to learn which letters are printed for the first time from manuscript, and which, furthermore, are, if printed elsewhere, here first collected. As it is the student must put himself to some trouble to gather these particulars.

It is regrettable, further, that the annotation to Addison's letters is not as full as it should have been, and that the two indexes are not entirely helpful. Addison served as Under-Secretary of State to Sir Charles Hedges, and to Sunderland; he was Secretary to two Lords Lieutenant of Ireland, and he was for a short time Secretary of State for the Southern Department. The letters here collected are largely addressed to those holding important official positions; they are concerned with people and events of the day; the meaning of many of the allusions can only be readily grasped by a reader intimately conversant with the history of the time. There are the letters to the Earl of Manchester containing news of naval affairs, foreign policy, and the union with Scotland; there are the letters written from Ireland to Godolphin and Sunderland; between sixty and seventy letters to

Joshua Dawson; letters to the Duke of Bolton, when he was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and letters to William King, Archbishop of Dublin. The historical interest of these letters will thus be realized, and especially of those bearing on Irish affairs. Essential annotation, unfortunately, is often lacking; the connection of persons named with Addison himself is imperfectly presented; an insufficient attempt has been made to identify many of the allusions, and unidentified names are omitted from the index; and an explanatory footnote frequently appears only after someone has been referred to in several earlier letters. If the footnotes fail, and help is sought in the index, the reader discovers that the official status of a person is sometimes given and sometimes is not.

Examples of defective annotation may be given. On pp. 233 and 285 the reader is put off with references to Trevelyan's *Queen Anne* for explanation of political crises. On 17 April 1710 (p. 213) Addison tells Joshua Dawson that 'we shake at Court'. No note explains the reason. On p. 216 'the late motion at court', which is causing alarm in Ireland, remains unexplained. The affair of the 'three broken Colonels' (Meredith, Maccartney, and Honeywood), p. 252, deserved a footnote, but has none. On p. 332 a note on the proceedings of the 'Committee of Elections' would not have been out of place. These are but a few examples of references to contemporary events not annotated. The letters to the Earl of Manchester should, in particular, have been accompanied by a better commentary.

The number of people referred to in these letters is, as would be expected, large, but descriptive footnotes are doled out parsimoniously. On p. 106 Addison speaks of 'The lady I formerly mention'd'. The reference is to Mrs. Masham although no note connects her with the 'Bed-chamber woman' mentioned on p. 92, where, again, a footnote merely names her, without stating who she was or explaining her influence with the Queen. Writing to Dawson (p. 205) Addison refers to Major-General Richard Gorges. A footnote gives no more than his name with a reference to Dalton's *Army Lists*. Gorges was a person of some importance in Ireland; he is mentioned twice again in subsequent letters; but the reader is offered no further help. On p. 231, again writing to Dawson, Addison mentions 'M^r Wogan'. The footnote adds his Christian name, 'Charles', and gives volume and page reference to a note in Ball's edition of Swift's *Correspondence*. The information should have been more detailed. In the same letter there is mention of 'M^r Southwell'. This is the second mention of Edward

Southwell, who was Secretary of State for Ireland, but no notes upon him appear till pp. 245, 248; and the Colonel Southwell named on p. 171, included in the index as if Edward, was a different person. Nor does the index guide the reader to the footnote on p. 245. The 'Greenville', who appears on p. 239, has no note. The index knows nothing of him, nor of the footnote to 'George Granville' on p. 242, although it gives references to 'Granville, George (or Grenville), later Baron Lansdowne'. In the same letter 'M^r Aislabie' is mentioned as the probable successor to Walpole in the office of 'Treasurer'. No footnote on John Aislabie appears till p. 341. The index does not draw attention to this note, nor to the mention of Aislabie on p. 239. 'Lowndes' is mentioned on p. 239 in connection with the Treasury. Not till p. 301 does a footnote explain that William Lowndes had been Secretary to the Treasury since 1695. William Bromley is mentioned without note on pp. 95, 96. On p. 124 we learn that he was 'M.P. for Oxford' (should be University of Oxford), 1702-32. At p. 290*n*. we learn incidentally that he was one of the Secretaries of State, and, at last, on p. 295, that he was Secretary of State for the Northern Department for a little over twelve months, 1713-14. Nor is it mentioned that in 1710, when we have many letters by Addison on the turn of parliamentary affairs, Bromley was chosen Speaker. Sir Richard Levinge, who enjoyed a very distinguished legal career in Ireland, is mentioned six times. There is no indication of who he was in the index or in any note. Samuel Dopping is named ten times as taking an active part in the debates of the Irish House of Commons. At an eleventh, and quite unimportant allusion to him, it is suggested that he may have been M.P. for Armagh. He was a man of considerable standing, and there is no doubt of his identity. He should have been more fully annotated. Further, he is almost certainly the 'Topping' of p. 252. In a letter to Ambrose Philips, pp. 249-50, 'Mr. Thomson' is mentioned in the postscript. The index ignores him. He is, of course, the 'Thompson', 'Thomson' mentioned in postscripts to two other letters to Philips, and these references the index does note. On p. 298 there is mention of 'M^r Hungerford'. A footnote informs us that his Christian name was 'John', and the index has no further enlightenment to offer. On p. 306 Sir Thomas Hanmer is named. On pp. 88, 95, 96, he appears as 'Hanmore', and no footnote tells us that he is to be identified with Hanmer, nor does the footnote on p. 306, nor the index, give any information, beyond the bare name, of this distinguished parlia-

mentarian who was, later, editor of an undistinguished Shakespeare. On p. 317 is printed a letter from Addison to the Earl of Stair in Paris. Not till p. 356 is there a note to explain that Stair was English Ambassador. On p. 217 'Serjeant Caulfield' is mentioned. A note on p. 318 merely gives his Christian name. He is mentioned three times again, once as suitable for appointment as a judge, and without note. The index contents itself with describing him as a 'jurist'. This is meagre annotation to letters addressed from or to Dublin. Caulfield's position in Ireland calls for further comment. In conjunction with Caulfield 'M^r Boate' is mentioned on p. 318. He is named again on pp. 320, 323. There is no footnote to him, nor any entry in the index, although Godfrey Boate became Prime Serjeant in the year in which Addison was writing. Some note to Lord Grantham, pp. 320, 395, might have been expected. On pp. 381-2 there is mention of a grant of £5000 to the 'Library of the College of Dublin', and further references to the same subject elsewhere. In the index these references are divided under two different headings. The footnote to p. 458 is mistaken. The French text of the letter printed on that page was first published in Swift's *Works* in 1766, not 1784.

Addison has suffered from his biographers, and Professor Graham has rendered a service in gathering this collection which extends far beyond the range of previous editors. These letters add materially to our knowledge of dates, facts, and movements in Addison's life, and they bring us a better understanding of him in his character as a government official. Beyond that they scarcely reach, for we see little of him as a companion, friend, or man of letters, save in the early letters. Addison's work as a government official may be less important than his contribution to literature, but it belonged in a minor *degré* to the history of his time, and it brought him into contact with Queen Anne's administration in England, Ireland, and abroad. It is a pity, therefore, that Professor Graham has not seen fit to provide the student with a more complete, considered, and regular editorial commentary.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

The Poems of Samuel Johnson. Edited by DAVID NICHOL SMITH and EDWARD L. MCADAM. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1941. Pp. xxvi+420. 25s. net.

This volume is a happy example of wise collaboration. The name of Professor Nichol Smith is a guarantee of ripe scholarship and Dr. McAdam has contributed the findings of his special research. They began their work independently. The senior editor had already before the last War made considerable progress in preparing an edition of Johnson's poems, and 'some parts had been completed more or less as they are now printed'. But 'work interrupted is not always easily resumed', and meanwhile Dr. McAdam had embarked on a similar enterprise. They happily joined forces. 'What was checked in its early stages by one European conflagration is thus now completed in the midst of another, when we may remember the lessons of *The Vanity of Human Wishes*.' The result is an edition as complete and as well annotated as the scholar or the general reader could wish for. The long delay has had its advantages in bringing to light manuscripts and other sources of information which were not available till recent years.

Some twenty poems were included in no previous collected edition, and a few are here printed for the first time, e.g. 'Upon the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude', a poem celebrating the tradition that these saints met a martyr's death, Simon in Britain and Jude in Persia. Although a schoolboy's performance, it anticipates the masculine style of the mature Johnson.

Full attention is rightly given to the major works: the two satires, which Walter Scott so heartily admired, and *Irene*, of which there is also printed in full the first draft from the manuscript in the British Museum. Goldsmith's comment on *London: A Poem in Imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal* is given: 'Imitation gives us a much truer idea of the ancients than even translation could do', and also Johnson's description of the *genre* in his *Life of Pope*: 'It is a kind of middle composition between translation and original design, which pleases when the thoughts are unexpectedly applicable and the parallels lucky'. The editors give all the help that is needed for a full understanding of the many political and literary allusions, and, besides recording all the variant readings, they often supply the probable reasons for Johnson's emendations, e.g. for altering the word *silenc'd* (*London*, l. 59) which time had made obsolete, and for abandoning the domestic suggestion of 'Now drops . . . the plate'

(*Vanity*, ll. 113-4). *Irene*, on which the author spent more pains than on any verse-composition of his, had, no doubt, a disappointing reception, but Johnson, 'Studious to please, yet not asham'd to fail', bore the disappointment manfully, and came to understand why it had failed. In later life, on hearing part of it read, he remarked that he 'thought it had been better'. Yet it is a not unworthy example of the power of this sturdy moralist to remodel Knolles's story and make it a vehicle of ethical and political thinking; and Demetrius on the ills of government and Aspasia on war and peace are not without topical interest to-day. The editors note Gibbon's two citations from *Irene* in *The Decline and Fall*, but do not point out that there are three words misquoted by Gibbon in the first citation of four lines and one mistake in the second citation. They also remark that Johnson, as an editor of Shakespeare, missed a point in not identifying Pistol's Hiren (2 *Hen. IV*, II. iv. 172) with his own heroine.

Of the shorter English poems there are few, if any, which equal the well-known lines 'On the Death of Dr. Robert Levet', but there are many which delight the reader with their wit and neatness, e.g. 'To Miss Hickman playing on the Spinet' (here printed from a manuscript in the R. B. Adam collection) and 'An Epitaph on Claudy Phillips, a Musician'. Wholly delightful, and (as the note makes clear) unhappily prophetic, is 'A Short Song of Congratulation' on the coming of age of Thrale's nephew, Sir John Lade; a better text is here provided from the manuscript in the Huntington Library.

The many Latin poems, whether translations or original, are not only generally worth having for themselves, but they afford a valuable insight into Johnson's mind and character. As the editors rightly claim: 'Latin was so much a living language to Johnson, so much a natural medium of expression in certain moods, that to treat his poems in that language as a mere exercise in ingenuity is to mistake their purpose and ignore their intimacy'. Of the original poems a fine example is the one on his completing the last revision of the *Dictionary*; he gave a copy to Beattie who found him 'in exceedingly good humour and spirit'. The editors usefully supply the younger Scaliger's epigram on dictionary makers, which is needed to elucidate Johnson's allusion. Another charming piece is 'On the Stream at Stowe Mill, Lichfield'. The editors have taken the trouble to discover how the topography has changed since Johnson's day, and they shrewdly suspect that the bathing-place, where his father *blanda*

voce taught him to swim, 'assumed larger dimensions and greater beauty in his mind's eye as he viewed it through the mist of memory'. They also identify *Nisus*, the friend addressed, as Edmund Hector, who remarked about their last meeting in the year that Johnson died: 'I perceive nothing gave him greater pleasure than calling to mind those days of our innocence'. In his old age and failing health Johnson found solace during sleepless nights in composing Latin verse. Sometimes he felicitously paraphrased the collects in the Book of Common Prayer; there is a beautiful rendering of the opening collect in the Communion office which he wrote on the occasion of his receiving the sacrament for the last time, eight days before his death. The paraphrases generally include some characteristic additions; indeed, No. VI (p. 207) seems to owe its origin less to the collect named by the editors than to his well-known dread of the decay of his faculties and death. In No. VII the word *frustra* recalls how Johnson could never hear without tears the verse beginning 'Tantus labor non sit cassus' in the *Dies Irae*. The most affecting of all is the original Prayer (p. 204) which he wrote on the night of 16 June, 1783, when he woke with a confusion of mind which he feared to be a paralytic stroke. As he wrote three days after to Mrs. Thrale: 'I was alarmed, and prayed God, that however he might afflict my body, he would spare my understanding. This prayer, that I might try the integrity of my faculties, I made in Latin verse. The lines were not very good, but I knew them not to be very good: I made them easily, and concluded myself to be unimpaired in my faculties'. We know and love Johnson the better for these lesser things being preserved.

The annotation throughout is all that can be desired. In the introductory notes to each poem, the sources and printings in the author's lifetime (often as many as twenty) are set out, its occasion, its authenticity and any circumstances attending its publication. A few examples of the thoroughness with which the editing is done may be given. A delightful note brings before us Burke and Joseph Warton discussing Johnson's use of the post-classical *variabilis*, both of them unaware that he has altered it to *mutabilis*. The editors discover from Johnson's dating of 'In Theatro' that the performance which he beguiled by writing his sapphics was not of 'an English Opera of Doctor Arne', as is stated in the unpublished *Piozziana*, but of no less a work than Handel's *Messiah*. The 'little French print of some people skating', inscribed with a French quatrain

which Mrs. Thrale asked Johnson to translate, is identified and the author of the French lines found. A natural misunderstanding of 'Bodley's dome' (*Vanity*, l. 139) is averted by a note giving the date of the Radcliffe Camera and the early use of *dome* for any building. It is seldom that the reader could wish for more. Perhaps a reference to Herodotus VII. 35 might be added to the note on Xerxes lashing the waves (*Vanity*, l. 232), and a reference to the *O.E.D.* s.v. Shore sb.⁴ for 'The common shore' (*London*, l. 94); possibly Johnson preferred *shore* to *sewer* as being the truer monosyllable. The title of *Marmor Norfolciense* (p. 108) should include the words 'By Probus Britanicus', especially as the book is not described as anonymous. The Index is very full and accurate. The references to the Introduction were obviously compiled before it was repaged; the reader will, however, find himself perfectly served if he will add 4 to the page-number given in every reference in the Index to the Introduction.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

The Poetry of Matthew Arnold. A Commentary by C. B. TINKER and H. F. LOWRY. Oxford University Press. Pp. xvi + 404. 12s. 6d. net.

Professors Tinker and Lowry (their names are not arranged alphabetically on the title-page) have made a most useful contribution to the study and assessment of Arnold as a poet, and also as a prose-writer. They 'have prefixed no introductory essay dealing with the development and cessation of Arnold as a poet because that is, in effect, the unifying subject of the book, however fragmentary and disunited it may at first appear', and they speak of 'the relation between Arnold's poetry and his philosophy of life, as well as . . . his inevitable transition from poetry to prose' (p. viii). The contribution they have made has a timely quality: it coincides with a stated revival of serious interest in Arnold's poetry. Professor Garrod has recently taken his temporary leave of Arnold with the phrase 'the greatest of the Victorian poets', and there are signs of interest in other quarters. Whatever work on Arnold is being done, this book will improve it: and, equally, all work on Arnold which has been done previously is the poorer for having lacked its aid.

To begin with, there is much new material: 'The plan of the present treatise came into being when the discovery of what is here called the Yale Manuscript disclosed a large amount of new information regarding Arnold's development as a poet. We have been

privileged to use, as well, a considerable store of other unpublished papers, and of books left in Arnold's library. These materials have often afforded the key, not merely to the origin of a poem, but also to its meaning and significance' (pp. vii f.). We are provided, for instance, with earlier drafts of *The Second Best* (the editors, wrongly, it seems, refer to it as 'the first draft') and of *Lines Written in Kew Gardens* (again called the 'first' draft); with a different version of *Stanzas from Carnac*; and with a new letter 'of supreme importance in its bearing upon . . . Arnold's personal history' (p. 169).

And then there are all the results of the industry that has gone into the book. The authors have gathered together from a hundred articles scattered in periodicals, well and little known, discussions of this and that point, adding many discoveries which they have made for themselves. They have annotated the poems from the angles of the thought and the sources, and related them to Arnold's personal and literary life; and they have stated clearly the places occupied by the poems in the course of the ever-changing editions. They regret that they have often failed to pin the composition of the poems down to a precise date. And there is one further limitation: they have not attempted to relate Arnold's poems closely to those of his contemporaries. Is it not of interest to note, for instance, that Julian Fane's *Poems* of 1852 contain *The Lay of Bragi* in which the Scandinavian 'god of Poetry . . . is introduced singing "the Death of Baldur"', and that Sydney Dobell published the first part of his *Balder* in 1853, 'in the last weeks' of which year Arnold, we are told, began to compose a poem similar at least in title? Or, again, to note that James Thomson, three months after Arnold's poem had appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*, wrote the poem entitled *Suggested by Matthew Arnold's 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse'*? Or, again, that there is Tennyson's *Merman* and *Mermaid* as well as Danish ballads and works of Andersen and Borrow at the back of Arnold's *Forsaken Merman*?

Of the many points that call for comment and question, I will mention four:

(1) We are told that 'The common assertion that [*The Strayed Reveller, and other Poems*, 1849] was suppressed is erroneous, for it was advertised, at the end of the volume of 1852, as still for sale' (p. 4). I have not seen the editions in question nor any books of about this date issued by the same publishers (Longmans?), but should like to be assured that the advertisement concerned is newly set up

for the 1852 volume and not part of a sheet or sheets printed earlier for insertion in any book that came along. If the sheet(s) were of this general nature, the publishers might not trouble themselves to cancel an item of information which had become obsolete: to cancel would be ugly or expensive, and to leave untouched would do no harm.

(2) On p. 12 comes a transcript of a list of poems which Arnold intended to compose. One item reads: '5 sonnets—outthunder—so far—when I have found. . . .' One is tempted to ask the editors to verify the reading 'outthunder'. Arnold was scarcely a Hopkins in his coinages! Perhaps it is not wholly impertinent to suggest a misreading: in Professor Lowry's transcript of the *Letters . . . to Arthur Hugh Clough* (1932), 'I hear a huge form, the Lower 5th' (p. 56) should presumably read 'I have . . .' or 'I teach . . .', 'their rulers . . . the riding class', '. . . the ruling class', 'there . . . rascallions' (p. 126) 'these . . . rascallions', and, among other small presumptions, 'Bhunlis Alp' (p. 110), 'Blumlis Alp' or 'Blümlis Alp'.

(3) In their paragraphs on Arnold's *Fragment of an 'Antigone'*, the authors might have taken the occasion to correct Professor Lowry's annotation of Letter 26 in the *Letters . . . to Arthur Hugh Clough* (p. 101), where the sentence 'But my Antigone supports me . . .' is explained as a tribute to Sophocles and his supporting power instead of as a reference to the play of which this fragment survives.

(4) One of the most interesting sections of the book concerns *Dover Beach* (pp. 173–8). We are given a hitherto unprinted draft of the first twenty-eight lines. This draft ends: 'And naked shingles of the world. Ah love etc.', which, the editors suggest, 'indicate[s] that the last nine lines of the poem as we know it were already in existence when the portion regarding the ebb and flow of the sea at Dover was composed. In other words, the draft of the poem here given was written as a prelude to the concluding paragraph of the lyric as finally published. It has probably struck readers that in that paragraph there is no reference to the sea or the tides'. The suggestion is a clever one though it is based on unwarrantable assumptions. Can we be sure, even though the draft is in pencil, that it is a first draft? With equal plausibility, we could assume that it represents Arnold revising the former part of a poem already completely written. Nor is there any point in the fact that there is no allusion to the sea in the final paragraph of the poem. Why should there be any such

allusion? There is no external law governing such things. Nor is there any reason to suppose different derivations for paragraphs which, though not seamlessly of a piece, do not contradict each other. The final paragraph speaks of a plain. But not of any or every plain. The authors suggest, and surely suggest rightly, that Arnold here is recalling Thucydides' account of the battle of Epipolæ, a battle, as the authors point out, which was a 'night attack, fought upon a plain at the top of a cliff, in the moonlight'. Though the conclusion of the poem, then, gives us no tide or sea, it gives us no less than three cross-references to the earlier paragraphs.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature. A series of Extracts and Illustrations. (Cornell Studies in English, XXXI.) Arranged and Adapted by Lane Cooper. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: Milford. 1940. Pp. xvi+239. 9s. 6d. net.

Professor Lane Cooper of Cornell University has republished a manual which has been in use for twenty-five years; it was originally compiled 'to free the student at the outset from misunderstandings of the nature of genius which interfere with his appreciation of the poets and of whatever formal treatise, such as the *Poetics* of Aristotle, he may first take up. . . . Evidence in the poets themselves respecting their habits of study and production . . . although there is really no lack of it, is neither easy to find nor easily arranged.'

The book opens with extracts from ancient and modern writers on discipline, design and method in art and science, followed by an account of two teachers, the scientist Agassiz and Professor Brewer of the University of London. 'The most remarkable characteristic of the latter was that he placed himself side by side with his pupils, teaching them as a fellow-learner . . . he would go through very little . . . some ten or twenty lines, perhaps, of Horace in a lecture; and he would discuss every word with us, eliciting our own knowledge or lack of knowledge respecting it, and with the dictionary before him, leading us step by step. . . . The consequence . . . was that a term or two under him in such a subject as classics placed a capable student in a position in which he could study successfully by himself. Instead of merely acquiring a store of opinions and facts, he had got hold of the true method of working.' In the section following, on 'Method in the Study of Literature', the student is told, in Wordsworth's words, 'that an

accurate taste in poetry is an acquired talent, which can only be produced by severe thought and a long continued intercourse with the best models of composition': and finally, 'a great poet ought . . . to rectify men's feelings, to give them new compositions of feeling, to render their feelings more sane'.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the section 'Illustrations of the Practice of Great Writers in Composing'. We have here the words of Ben Jonson, Dr. Johnson, Rousseau, Coleridge, Newman and Lamb, eyewitness records of Coleridge by Gillman and of Wordsworth by Dorothy Wordsworth, and, less important, accounts of some other writers. This section is preceded by letters of Wordsworth mostly to W. R. Hamilton, offering detailed criticism of his verses (an example for any teacher to his pupil). In the last of them Wordsworth repeats that 'the composition of verse is infinitely more of an art than men are prepared to believe, and absolute success in it depends on innumerable minutiae. . . . Milton speaks of pouring "easy unpremeditated verse." . . . I could point out to you five hundred passages upon which labour has been bestowed, and twice five hundred more to which additional labour would have been serviceable; not that I regret the absence of such labour, because no poem contains more proof of skill acquired by practice [than *Paradise Lost*].' It would have been in accordance with the principles suggested in this book that at this point the reader should have been confronted, not with an account of the Trinity College manuscript of Milton's minor poems, a manuscript of which it is very difficult to give an account, or by interpretations, however perceptive, of Milton's corrections, but by specimens of the alterations. When Shaler began to work with Agassiz he was set down before a small fish to find out what he could about it without damaging the specimen, without reading and without discussion. At first bewildered, after a week he had something inadequate to report, after another week of ten hours a day he had results which astonished himself and satisfied his teacher. As a result of such discipline, Shaler soon came to feel 'a sense of power in dealing with things'. In lecturing, the good teacher still leaves room for the listener's imagination, and in class does not interpose between the student and his appropriate activity and deprive himself of one of the sources of his own energy, the sight of a pupil coming into the use of his gifts.

The next section, 'On the Studies of Poets', opens with an interesting essay by Mr. Cooper on Wordsworth's reading. 'It is the interest

of Wordsworth's career taken as a crucial instance of the relation between poetry and scholarship that it shows a definite attempt to supply in the prime of life what he considered a defect in his training hitherto'—although that literary training was wider and more arduous than freshmen or (Mr. Cooper points out) critics on this side of the Atlantic have sometimes supposed. The exquisite justice of human feeling in *The Idiot Boy*, for instance, was not uninformed by acquaintance with technical work on the psychology of the abnormal. He read widely in the books of travellers; and matter from these recorders of facts, who were not 'writers' but used, in a state of lively, normal feeling the real language of men, lay in his mind sometimes for years and was fused at last with other experience into poetry. But what are we to deduce from the example given of Tennyson's use of a traveller's knowledge? With some verses in his hand he asked Wallace, 'Is an expanse of tropical forest *dark*, seen from above?'

'Not particularly; less so than an English woodland'. 'Then I must change the word "dark".'

It is noteworthy that the next essay in this American book should be of a poet, quite certainly the first in the world for some rare things, whom the English hardly set about knowing, Burns. Here the student is shown by Minto, 'the historical relationships' of a poet, the relationships which we attempt first to know and finally to discount on knowing any poet. Burns too was a hard reader: but poets absorb and are not absorbed by books. The list of Byron's reading made by himself at nineteen is next printed, with some account of books read by Spenser and Shakespeare, Milton's account of his own education, and Masson's of Milton's plans and studies for *Paradise Lost*.

The manual closes with passages chosen mainly from or about Plato, Dante, Herbert, Wordsworth, and *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, reaffirming 'the bond between vigorous method and the artistic utterance of passion'. CHARLOTTE MACDONALD.

SHORT NOTICES

The Novel and Society: A Critical Study of the Modern Novel. By N. ELIZABETH MONROE. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1941. Pp. x+282. \$3.00.

The predicative manner of Miss Monroe's book may weary some readers, and opinions expressed will undoubtedly provoke dissent. But this is as it should be, for she holds strong opinions about the nature of man and his place in the universe. These lay foundations for her concept of the novel as an artistic form and her

understanding of its function in society. She writes as a Catholic, and as a traditionalist, holding that art should be conscious not only of things seen and temporal, but of the things which are not seen and eternal. She is oppressed by the decay of human values in our modern civilization, by the loss of moral conviction, and by the exaltation of technique as an end in itself. 'Fiction', she declares, 'will not flourish in a decadent society'; and because the novelist, no less than the society in which he lives, has substituted disillusionment and technical experiment for faith in the unseen realities, she finds that, with other forms of art, the novel is losing its place. Salvation lies in a return to the universals, and to a realization that if 'fiction reaches the plane of literature it is bound to be moral'.

It need scarcely be said that, judged by this message and doctrine, the survivors are few. Somerset Maugham, Aldous Huxley, Charles Morgan, and Ernest Hemingway sin against the light; Arnold Bennett's materialism blinds him to the greatness that is in man; Henry James and the 'stream of consciousness' experimentalists forget that the unconscious is not the whole, for potentiality is further revealed in action.

Miss Monroe sustains her indictment and her challenge by the critical study of six women novelists, Sigrid Undset, Selma Lagerlöf, Edith Wharton, Ellen Glasgow, Virginia Woolf, and Willa Cather, prefacing her studies with a chapter on the novel of to-day and concluding with the novel of the future. She makes no claim that the novel is peculiarly a feminine province, but that, if these six examples be kept in mind, there is a securer hope for its future. In her last chapter, however, Miss Monroe is plainly in difficulties when she attempts to find a harmony, or even an appearance of likeness, in the members of her sextet. Sigrid Undset alone comes near to her ideal.

At the conclusion of an outspoken book the reader can scarcely avoid questioning whether these separate studies, justifying a common theme, have not been forced into a rather unwilling alliance. The doctrine and the illustrative commentary tend to fall apart. Nevertheless this is an ably written book deserving of respect and attention.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

The Bible in its Ancient and English Version. Edited by H. WHEELER ROBINSON. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1940. Pp. viii+337. 12s. 6d.

This composite volume begins with excellent chapters on the Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Latin Bibles; they will give the reader who is unfamiliar with these languages some useful light on their differing qualities. Sir William Craigie deals with the English versions up to Wyclif and discusses the vexed question of the authorship of the Wycliffite versions. Mr. J. Isaacs follows with two chapters entitled 'The Sixteenth-Century English Versions' and 'The Authorized Version and after'. Though the ground has been often traversed, he has many fresh and interesting points to make, and he shows himself sensitive to the delicate nuances of cadence and rhythm. His account of the changes made in the A.V. since 1611 by editors and printers will be news to many readers, and still fewer will know of Dr. Edward Harwood's *Liberal Translation of the New Testament* (1768). The translator asks to be measured by the language of 'Hume, Robertson, Lowth, Lyttleton, Hurd, Melmoth, Johnson and Hawkesworth'. Some specimens are given; they need to be seen to be believed; and yet they have some merit and certainly reflect the mind and taste of the eighteenth century only too faithfully. A chapter on the Revised Version by Dr. C. J. Cadoux gives valuable information upon the relative authority of the marginal readings: 'when it is remembered that a two-thirds majority was required for any rendering on the second and final revision before it could be admitted to the text, it will be realized that some of the most valuable work of the Revisers had to go into the margins.' He also discusses the characteristic differences between the Oxford and Cambridge aims in translation, and agrees with Sanday that, 'for good or ill, the Cambridge genius presided over the English Revision'. All the contributors to this volume are well qualified to write on their particular province, and the general reader, besides the scholar, will find something to interest and inform him in every chapter.

F. E. H.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, Oct.-Nov.

1941—

The medieval reader and textual criticism (Henry John Chaytor), pp. 49-56.

The dawn of the Revival of Learning (Henry Guppy), pp. 206-24.

To be continued.

Note on Marlorat's *Exposition of the Revelation of St. John*. Translator A. Golding. 1574 (Francis Buckley), pp. 225-7.

Some sidelights on *Hamlet*, II. ii.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. XXXIV, No. 1, December 1941—

Anthony Munday's journey to Rome, 1578-9 (Beatrice Hamilton Thompson), pp. 1-14.

The principle of uniformity in English metre (J. Redwood Anderson), pp. 33-49.

ELH, Vol. VIII, No. 4, December 1941—

Wynner and Wastoure and the Hundred Years' War (Gardiner Stillwell), pp. 241-7.

Chaucer's *The House of Fame* (Paull F. Baum), pp. 248-56.

Spenser and the school of Alanus (Helen Andrews Kahin), pp. 257-72.

The Elizabethan background of neo-classic polite verse (Clay Hunt), pp. 273-304.

What Browning's literary reputation owed to the Pre-Raphaelites 1847-1856 (Maurice Browning Cramer), pp. 305-21.

HISTORY, Vol. XXVI, No. 102, September 1941—

Canterbury and Paris in the reign of Æthelberht (Margaret Deanesly), pp. 97-104.

Ways and means in Elizabethan propaganda (Gladys Jenkins), pp. 105-114.

THE LIBRARY, Vol. XXII, No. 1, June 1941—

Medieval writing-masters (S. H. Steinberg), pp. 1-24.

A bibliographical problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare (Giles E. Dawson), pp. 25-33.

On the printing of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Troilus*.

The different states of the first edition of *Paradise Lost* (James H. Pershing), pp. 34-66.

Sir Hans Sloane's printed books (Jeremiah S. Finch), pp. 67-72.

Editions of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (Frank Mott Harrison), pp. 73-81.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LVI, No. 7, November 1941—

An attack on John Fielding (William Robert Irwin), pp. 523-5.

On the pamphlet *Jonathan Wild's Advice to his Successors*, 1758.

Dr. Johnson, Mrs. Thrale, and Boswell: three letters (Dixon Wecter), pp. 525-9.

On three 'missing' letters: Chapman, 211.1 and 707.1; Tinker, No. 167.

"Though, Phyllis, your prevailing charms" (Arthur Mizener), pp. 529-30.

On the ascription to Dorset and evidence for Buckingham's authorship.

An observation on Chaucer's *Astrolabe* (Karl Erik Elmquist), pp. 530-4.

The last of the Miller's head? (Francis Lee Utley), pp. 534-6.

Notes on the text of Shelley's translations from Plato (James A. Noto-poulos), pp. 536-41.

Three new letters of Matthew Arnold (Ian A. Gordon), pp. 552-4.

Letters in the Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand.

Aphra Behn and Montfleury (Montague Summers), p. 562.

On the writer's anticipation of a note in *M.L.N.*, Vol. LIV (June 1939), pp. 438-9.

— Vol. LVI, No. 8, December 1941—

The Apocrypha and Chaucer's *House of Fame* (Leo J. Henkin), pp. 583-8.

Some observations on the 1663 edition of *Faustus* (Seymour M. Pitcher), pp. 588-94.

The Ladder of Lechery, *The Faerie Queene*, III. i. 45 (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 594-7.

Sir Thomas Elyot against Poetry (George B. Pace), pp. 597-9.

Chapman and Phaer (Phyllis Brooks Bartlett), pp. 599-601.

Jacques' 'Seven Ages' and Pedro Mexia (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 601-3.

The Elizabethan translation of Vegetius' *De re militari* (Henry J. Webb), pp. 605-6.

Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's 'Cupid and my Campaspe' (Ernst G. Mathews), pp. 606-7.

John Donne's 'little rag' (Ernst G. Mathews), pp. 607-9.

On the 'little ragge of Monte Magor' referred to in Donne's letter to Sir Robert Ker.

Donne and the Bezoar (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 609-11.

Nahum Tate, Laureate: two biographical notes (H. F. Scott-Thomas), pp. 611-2.

The authorship of *A General View of the Stage* (William Hubert Miller), pp. 612-4.

Evidence for Thomas Wilkes's authorship.

'A Paradise within thee' in Milton, Byron, and Shelley (Paul Siegel), pp. 615-7.

Byron's return from Greece (Stephen A. Larrabee), pp. 618-9.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LVII, No. 1, January 1941—

The burden in carols (Rossell Hope Robbins), pp. 16-22.

John Gower and the *De Genealogia Deorum* (Dorothy A. Dilts), pp. 23-5.
Observations on Dante and the *Hous of Fame* (Dorothy A. Dilts),
pp. 26-8.

Chaucer mentions a book (Marshall W. Stearns), pp. 28-31.

Chaucer and 'Arnold of the Newe Toun' (Edgar Hill Duncan), pp. 31-3.
'When he his "papur" soghte', CT A-4404 (R. Blenner-Hassett),

pp. 34-5.

Some Nashe marginalia concerning Marlowe (Paul H. Kocher),
pp. 45-9.

On some unpublished holograph marginalia in a copy of Leland's
Principium . . . Encomia.

The exchange of weapons in *Hamlet* (James L. Jackson), pp. 50-5.

The première of *The Mourning Bride* (Emmett L. Avery), pp. 55-7.

Cokain's *The Obstinate Lady* and the *Araucana* (Ernst G. Mathews),
pp. 57-8.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 181, No. 23, November 29, 1941—

Authorship of the review 'On Hogg's Memoirs' in *Blackwood*, 1821
(Alan Lang Strout), pp. 302-3.

— December 6—

Browning correspondence: corrections for editions 1933 and 1936
(S. N. Ray), p. 315.

— December 13—

Miscellaneous letters to, from, and about James Hogg (Alan Lang
Strout), pp. 324-7.

Continued December 27, pp. 352-9; January 31, 1942, pp. 59-61.

Notes on the *Oxford English Dictionary* (St. Vincent Troubridge),
pp. 327-9.

Further notes February 7, 1942, p. 77; March 7, 1942, pp. 134-6.

— December 20—

Two bibliographical notes on *The Kingis Quair* (Grover Cronin Jr.),
pp. 341-2.

— Vol. 182, January 3, 1942—

Winthrop Mackworth Praed (Derek Hudson), p. 7.

Addenda to the writer's bibliography.

— January 17—

Surviving original materials in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* (W. L. Hal-
stead), pp. 30-1.

Poe and the artist John P. Frankenstein (Olybrius), pp. 31-2.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

NOTES AND QUERIES, January 31—

Three uncollected poems by Joseph Hall (Arnold Davenport), pp. 58-9.

— February 28—

An Elizabethan controversy: Harvey and Nashe (Arnold Davenport), pp. 116-9.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, January 1942—

The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women and the *Lai de Franchise* (Marian Lossing), pp. 15-35.

Shakespeare and some conventions of Old Age (Ernest H. Cox), pp. 36-46.

Some pictorial aspects of early *commedia dell'arte* acting (John H. McDowell), pp. 47-64.

George Hickes and the origin of the Bangorian controversy (William Bradford Gardner), pp. 65-78.

The author of *Elizabeth Brownrigge*: a review of Thackeray's techniques (Ernest Boll), pp. 79-101.

Elizabeth Barrett and Browning's *The Flight of the Duchess* (Fred Manning Smith), pp. 102-17.

The influence of the ballads in Housman's poetry (Tom Burns Haber), pp. 118-29.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 29, 1941—

Swift's secret (Harold Williams), p. 596.

Wordsworth and Coleridge (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 596.

On the fragment 'Beauty and Moonlight'. Further correspondence from E. H. W. Meyerstein and James R. Sutherland, December 6, p. 611; from E. de Selincourt, December 20, p. 643.

— December 6—

John Keats sits in judgment (M. Buxton Forman), p. 624.

— December 13—

The Cleek 'um Inn (Bruce Dickins), p. 632.

Baron Corvo (Montague Summers), p. 636.

Reply from Oswald J. Murphy, December 20, p. 643; from Edward Hutton, December 27, p. 655; from Montague Summers, January 10, 1942, p. 19.

Additions to Scott's Poems (W. M. Parker), p. 636.

— December 20—

Caldigate novels (Michael Sadleir), p. 643.

Reply, January 7, 1942, p. 7.

Sidney's 'King James of Scotland' (James Craigie), p. 648.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 27—

Drydeniana (R. Jack Smith), p. 655.

Addendum to Macdonald's Bibliography.

Poet in bondage: a picture of John Clare (A Correspondent), p. 657.

Wordsworth to John Scott (W. M. Parker), p. 660.

— January 3, 1942—

George Eliot's Letters (Gordon S. Haight), p. 7.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of letters to Martha Jackson.

— January 10—

The text of Trollope (Alan Wadé), p. 24.

— January 17—

King James on Bacon (N. E. McClure), p. 31.

Engravers called Blake (Geoffrey Keynes), p. 36.

Lyrical Ballads, 1798 (John Edwin Wells), p. 36.

— January 24—

Blake's 'Jerusalem' (Charles Marriott), p. 43.

Blake's copper-plates (Geoffrey Keynes), p. 48.

— January 31—

The Pilgrim's Progress (Ruthven Todd), p. 55.

On Blake's illustrations.

Southey and Marston (Arthur M. Coon), p. 55.

— February 7—

A Byron poem (C. L. Cline), p. 67.

Reply from W. M. Brown, February 14, p. 84.

Othello and C. Furius Cresinus (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 72.

— February 28—

Milton and Edward Phillips (William Riley Parker), p. 96.

